DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 566	FL 016 119
AUTHOR	Guthrie, Larry F.; And Others
TITLE	Site and Sample Descriptions. SBIF Study: Part II.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	SBIF-83-R.11
PUB DATE	Dec 83
CONTRACT	400-80-0026
NOTE	114p.; For related documents, see FL 016 113-120.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Asian Americans; Basic Skills; Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; Cubans; Cultural Awareness; Educational Assessment; English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; Filipino Americans; Hispanic Americans; Language of Instruction; Limited English Speaking; Mexican Americans; Program Evaluation; Puerto Ricans; Scheduling; *Student Characteristics; Student Participation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Styles; Vietnamese People
IDENTIFIERS	Chinese People; Navajo (Nation)

ABSTRACT

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) study identified, described, and verified features of bilingual instruction of a wide variety of limited English proficient (LEP) students. It collected data on instructional organization, time allocation, classroom language use, active teaching behaviors, academic learning time, student participation styles, and classroom, school, and community context variables at eight sites serving LEP students representing Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chinese, Navajo, Filipino, and Vietnamese ethnolinguistic groups. This report presents descriptive data about the the eight sites and the students and teachers. The data include district enrollments and ethnic composition, staff and student language characteristics, community descriptions, class enrollments and proportions of LEP students, students' instructional participation styles, and participating teachers' professional training and experience in general and bilingual education. Synthesis of the teacher data also revealed teacher perceptions of three aspects of bilingual education: entry/exit criteria, philosophy, and program effectiveness. The information gathered is intended as background information for analysis and reporting of the overall study and its components. (MSE)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED297566

FL

SIGNIFICANT
BILINGUAL
INSTRUCTIONAL
FEATURES
STUDY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Guthrie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SITE AND SAMPLE DESCRIPTIONS
SBIF STUDY: PART II

by

Larry F. Guthrie
Becky S. McReynolds
and
Charles W. Fisher

Document SBIF-83-R.11
December 1983

FL 016 119

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report is one of a series produced for the
SIGNIFICANT BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES STUDY
by the National Consortium for SBIF:

ARC Associates
CEMREL, Inc.
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
Florida State University
Hunter College of CUNY
Navajo Division of Education
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
University of Hawaii

This document has been produced under
Contract No. 400-80-0026 from the
National Institute of Education,
U.S. Department of Education to the
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
However, it does not reflect the views of
the Institute, the Department, or the Laboratory.

ABSTRACT

The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) descriptive study was intended to identify, describe, and verify important features and consequences of bilingual instruction for limited English proficient (LEP) students.

This report from Part II of the SBIF study presents descriptive data on the macro-level context of the eight sites as well as on the target student and teacher samples. The geographically diverse sites represented Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chinese, Navajo, Filipino, and Vietnamese ethnolinguistic groups. Part II of the study included 356 target students and 89 teachers.

The macro-level data reported here reflect the communities, school districts, and district bilingual education programs examined at each site. These data include district enrollments and ethnic compositions, staff language characteristics, and community descriptions. The information on bilingual programs describes their adoption, funding, language assessment procedures, and policies and goals.

The description of the student sample includes these data: the number of schools, classes, and students studied; language characteristics of the students; class enrollments and the proportions of LEP students; and the instructional participation styles of the students.

The data regarding the participating teachers describe the teachers' first languages, years of general and bilingual teaching experience, and general and bilingual professional training. The data further report the languages used during instruction in the study classrooms, and the teachers' estimates of the amount of instructional time spent using a non-English language or teaching classes in English as a Second Language (ESL). In addition, the teacher sample data resulted in a synthesis of teacher perceptions of three aspects of bilingual education: entry/exit criteria, philosophy, and program effectiveness.

These site and sample descriptions are intended to serve as background information for the analysis and reporting of the studies on verification (Substudy I-A and Substudy I-B) and stability (Substudy II-A and Substudy II-B) undertaken during Part II of the SBIF study.

PREFACE

In October of 1980, the National Institute of Education (NIE) provided funding for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWLERD) to form, in conjunction with eight other nationally prominent educational institutions and agencies, a consortium for the descriptive study of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF). This is a three-year, multifaceted study of significant bilingual instructional practices and elements in bilingual instructional settings, and as such, it is part of the proposed work scope of the Part C Coordinating Committee on Bilingual Education Research (U.S. Department of Education). The intent is to provide important information that will increase understanding of bilingual instruction, and subsequently increase opportunities for students with limited or no proficiency in English to participate fully and successfully in the educational process.

The study was designed in two parts. Part I identified and described those features of bilingual instruction considered to be significant in terms of their consequences for limited English proficient (LEP) students. In Part II, these findings were verified in four major studies.

Part I of the study took place during the 1980-81 school year, and Part II occurred in 1981-82. Data analysis for Part I was accomplished by October of 1981. Part II data are undergoing analysis, and reporting will be completed by September of 1983, at which time the project terminates.

Overall Strategy of the Study

The SBIF descriptive study is one of several research activities guided by the Part C Research Agenda for Bilingual Education, in direct response to a Congressional mandate issued in 1978. In search of data to inform its consideration for renewal of support for bilingual education, Congress directed the Secretary of Education to "develop a national research program for bilingual education." In turn, the directors of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) were instructed to coordinate a program of research to respond to Congress' questions.

Results from this study, along with those from other specially commissioned studies, are expected to provide Congress with information regarding instructional features that provide successful access to learning for LEP students, as well as the long-range consequences of these features. Furthermore, along with results from other studies conducted under the aegis of the Part C Research Agenda, findings from the SBIF study are expected to inform practice, thus resulting in their inclusion in instructional programs for LEP students.

Consortium Formed to Conduct the Study

The study was conducted by a consortium of nine educational institutions and agencies, collaborating with school districts that serve ethnolinguistically diverse student populations. Consortium members, participating school districts, and targeted ethnolinguistic populations included in both parts of the study were:

- ARC Associates, Inc., in collaboration with the Oakland and San Francisco school districts, California, focusing on students whose home language is one of the Chinese languages--Sau-Lim Tsang, principal investigator.

- Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, in collaboration with the San Francisco Unified School District, California, focusing on multilingual classrooms with students representing many home languages--Joaquin Armendariz, principal investigator.

- Florida State University, in collaboration with the Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida, focusing on Cuban and Cuban-American students whose home language is Spanish--Roger Kaufman, principal investigator.

- Hunter College of the City University of New York, in collaboration with Community School District 4, New York City, focusing on Puerto Rican students whose home language is Spanish--Jose A. Vazquez-Faria, principal investigator.

- Navajo Nation Division of Education in collaboration with schools serving the Navajo Nation in northeastern Arizona--Gail Goodman, principal investigator.

- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, in collaboration with El Paso Public Schools, El Paso, Texas, focusing on Mexican and Mexican-American students whose home language is Spanish--Domingo Dominguez, principal investigator.

Consortium members and school districts participating in Part II only of the study were:

- CEMREL, Inc., in collaboration with the Chicago Public Schools, Illinois, focusing on classrooms in which the home language of many students is Spanish--Harriet Doss-Willis, principal investigator.

- Northwest Regional Education Laboratory, in collaboration with the Salem, Oregon, public schools, focusing on students whose home language is either Vietnamese or Spanish--Alfredo Aragon, principal investigator.

- o University of Hawaii, in collaboration with the Hawaii Department of Education, focusing on Filipino students whose home language is Ilokano--Morris Lai, principal investigator.

Description of the Study

As stated earlier, the study was designed in two phases. Part I identified and described features of bilingual instruction considered to be significant in terms of their consequences for students of limited English proficiency. This part of the study involved 232 target students in 58 classrooms at six nationally representative sites. Part II of the study focused on verification of the features and consequences identified during Part I. This second phase of the study included 356 target students in 89 classrooms at eight sites. Both parts of the study are described below.

Part I of the Study

Schools and classrooms identified as successful bilingual instructional settings served as the focus of the study. In its proposal, the consortium argued that significant bilingual instructional features are more likely to be found in such settings. Thus, the 58 classrooms in the Part I sample were nominated by constituents at their respective sites to be among the most successful bilingual instructional settings in the participating school districts.

In its first year, the study addressed research questions related to six sets of research constructs. These constructs were: the indicators of successful bilingual instructional settings; the macro-level context data; the organizational structure of the classrooms; allocation of time; teacher variables; and student variables. These constructs, the research questions addressed, and data sources are presented in table form in Chapter One of this report.

While the majority of data sources for the study were located within the classrooms, two additional sources of information were also considered important. Although outside the immediate vicinity of the classroom, they nevertheless impinge upon and influence both instructional activites and their eventual impact or consequences for students of limited English proficiency. These are (a) what constituents of bilingual education--e.g., parents, teachers, students, administrators--consider indicators of success in bilingual instruction and what these mean for LEPs; and (b) what constitutes the macro-level context variables that further define and describe the school, district, and community in which the bilingual instructional settings in the

From January through June of the 1980-81 school year, classroom data for Part I of the study were collected. There were two levels of data collection activites. The first (Level 1) involved the collection of several kinds of data from the sample classrooms at each of the consortium sites. At the second (Level 2), one or two classrooms were studied intensively at each site in order to produce an ecological case study for each.

Level 1 data collection. For the 58 classrooms of the study sample, four sets of constructs were included in the Level 1 data collection. These were: (a) *organizational structure* of the classroom in terms of language of instruction, content (subject), work group size and composition, degree and nature of cooperation/collaboration among students, student choice options, nature and mode of teacher's evaluation of student work, and interdependency of these factors for work completion; (b) *allocation of time* by content, by language of instruction (L1 or L2) and by who is instructing (teacher or other adult), to use of instructional materials in L1 and L2, to LEP students and to others, and among different instructional activities; (c) *teacher variables* in terms of active teaching, teachers' expectations and sense of efficacy; and (d) *student variables* in terms of language proficiency, participation in classroom learning activities, academic achievement with emphasis on academic learning time for reading/language arts and mathematics instruction, and social cognitive understanding of students.

Level 2 data collection. The second level of the Part I study resulted in nine intensive, ecological case studies of bilingual instruction. These case studies were designed to obtain richer, more detailed information for nine of the classrooms included in the first level of data collection for Part I. The nine classrooms included two kindergarten classes, one first grade class, one combination grades one-two class, one second grade class, one combination grades two-three class, one combination grades three-four-five class, and two fifth grade classes.

Data were collected in the following sequence: (a) a *teacher interview* was conducted to determine instructional goals and how the classroom operates as an instructional-social system, as well as to describe a student who functions successfully in this system; (b) then, for each of three or four *instructional events*, (1) an interview was conducted with the teacher to determine the intent of instruction for that event; (2) observation of instruction followed, focusing concurrently on the teacher and on the four target students; (3) a debriefing interview was conducted with the teacher, to learn if instruction had proceeded as intended and if, in his/her opinion, target students had "learned" what was intended; and (4) debriefing interviews were conducted with target students to determine what they believed they were being asked to do, if they felt they had been successful at completing tasks and how they knew this, and their social cognitive understandings of how the classroom instructional-social system operates.

Table i provides a list of documents and reports emerging from Part I of the SBIF study.

Table i

Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part I

Document/Report Number	Title
SBIF-80-D.1	Description of the Study
SBIF-80-D.2	Research Design: Part I of the SBIF Study
SBIF-80-D.1.1	Overview of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-D.1.1	Review of the Literature for a Descriptive Study of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features
SBIF-81-D.3	Sample Description and Data Gathering Schedules: Part I of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-R.4	Preliminary Analysis of Part I of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-D.6	Criteria to Select Instructional Features and Consequences for Limited English Language Proficient Students for Part II of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-D.7	Research Design: Part II of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-D.7.1	Accommodation of the Seminar of Scholars' Recommendations for the Part II Research Design
SBIF-81-R.7	Executive Summary of Part I of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-R.6-I	Volume I: Introduction and Overview of Part I of the Study
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-II	Volume II: Success Indicators and Consequences for Limited English Language Proficient Students in the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-R.2/ R.6-III.1	Volume III.1: Bilingual Instructional Perspectives: Organization of Bilingual Instruction in the Classrooms of the SBIF Study
SBIF-81-R.3/ R.6-III.2	Volume III.2: Bilingual Instructional Perspectives: Allocation of Time in the Classrooms of the SBIF Study

Table i (continued)

Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part I

Document/Report Number	Title
SBIF-81-R.6-IV	Volume IV: Teaching in Successful Bilingual Instructional Settings
SBIF-81-R.6-V	Volume V: Consequences for Students in Successful Bilingual Instructional Settings
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.1	Appendix A.1: Macro-level Context Report: Site 01
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.2	Appendix A.2: Macro-level Context Report: Site 02
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.3	Appendix A.3: Macro-level Context Report: Site 03
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.4	Appendix A.4: Macro-level Context Report: Site 04
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.5	Appendix A.5: Macro-level Context Report: Site 05
SBIF-81-R.6-I-A.6	Appendix A.6: Macro-level Context Report: Site 06
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.1	Appendix B.1: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Kindergarten: Site 01
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.2	Appendix B.2: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 1 & 2: Site 01
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.3	Appendix B.3: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 2 & 3: Site 02
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.4	Appendix B.4: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) Grade 2: Site 03
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.5	Appendix B.5: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Navajo) in Grade 1: Site 04
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.6	Appendix B.6: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Cantonese) in Grade 5: Site 05

Table i (continued)

Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part I

Document/Report Number	Title
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.7	Appendix B.7: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/ Cantonese) in Grade 5: Site 05
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.8	Appendix B.8: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Grade 1: Site 06
SBIF-81-R.5/ R.6-VI-B.9	Appendix B.9: An Ecological Case Study of Bilingual Instruction (English/Spanish) in Combined Grades 3, 4, & 5: Site 06
SBIF-81-R.6-C	Training Manual for Data Collection: SBIF Study
SBIF-81-R.8	State-of-the-Project Report: SBIF Study

Part II of the Study

Information from Part I data analysis provided the basis for Part II of the study. Part II has been carried out during the second and third years of funding (1981-82 and 1982-83 school years). It is intended to verify the findings from Part I. The verification activities include:

- Verification of aspects of instruction identified in the Part I study classrooms in other ethnolinguistic bilingual instructional settings. To accomplish this, inquiry was focused on new classrooms added to the sample at three consortium sites (CEMREL, University of Hawaii, and Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory) as well as new classrooms at Part I sites (Study I-A/B).

- Stability of the instructional system and process across two academic years. To accomplish this, ten teachers from the Part I classrooms observed during the 1980-81 school year were studied with a new group of students in Part II during the 1981-82 school year (Study II-A). Stability in terms of LEP students' participation in bilingual instruction was also studied. In doing so, 86 students observed in Part I were followed into their new classrooms in the 1981-82 school year (Study II-B).

- Utility from both research and program improvement perspectives.

To accomplish this, teachers from four of the Part I study classrooms were asked to select, from among the variety of significant bilingual instructional features identified in Part I, those they considered most useful in instructing LEP students (Study III).

- Compatibility of Part I findings with those of related research--e.g., research on teaching per se, bilingual education research, successful schools research, research in related academic disciplines, and other research sponsored by the Part C Coordinating Committee. To accomplish this, Part I findings were addressed by recognized researchers in the above areas. They prepared analytical papers comparing their data with Part I findings, these were the focus of a national working meeting held in February 1983 (Study IV).

Table ii presents the list of reports associated with Part II of the SBIF study.

Table ii

Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part II

Document/Report Number	Title
SBIF-83-R.11	Site and Sample Descriptions SBIF Study: Part II
SBIF-83-R.12	Verification of Bilingual Instructional Features
SBIF-83-R.13	Stability of Instructional System and Process for a Sample of Ten Bilingual Teachers in the SBIF Study
SBIF-83-R.13.1	Stability of Instructional System and Process for a Sample of Eighty-Five Students in the SBIF Study
SBIF-83-R.15/16	Utility of the SBIF Features for the Instruction of LEP Students
SBIF-83-R.9/10	Compatibility of the SBIF Features with Other Research on Instruction for LEP Students
SBIF-83-R.14	Executive Summary: Part II of the SBIF Study

This report provides descriptive data on the macro-level context of the eight SBIF Part II study sites as well as on the target student and teacher samples. These site and sample descriptions are intended to serve as background information for the reporting and analysis of the four areas of verification studies undertaken during Part II. (See documents SBIF-83-R.12, SBIF-83-R.13, SBIF-83-R.13.1, SBIF-83-R.15/16, & SBIF-83-R.9/10.)

The macro-level context data regarding the school districts, communities, bilingual education programs, and sample schools and classes were collected from a great variety of sources. The student data were obtained from the teachers and from classroom observations while the teacher data came from open-ended interviews and responses to a teacher language survey.

Charles W. Fisher
Principal Investigator
December 1983

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The National Consortium for the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study would like to acknowledge the contributions of the thousands of students and hundreds of classroom teachers who participated in the study. The dedication of the staffs at the nine consortium sites, and the sustained cooperation of district administrators and school principals were critical to the achievement of study goals. Approximately 100 data collectors representing five different language groups were involved in the fieldwork. The study was thoughtfully advised on research and policy issues by a Seminar of Scholars and a Policy Implications Advisory Panel. The talent, energy, and perseverance of all of these contributors is deeply appreciated.

During the analysis and reporting phases of the study there was substantive and editorial input from a wide range of people. The Consortium is especially grateful for the many contributions of the site project directors: Migdalia Romero and Ana Maria Villegas (New York); Maria Masud and Alicia Rojas (Florida); Ana Macias (Texas); Gail Goodman (Arizona); Larry F. Guthrie, John Lum, and Kalei Inn (Oakland, California); Joaquin Armendariz and Christine Baker (San Francisco, California); Astacia Wright (Illinois); Felipe Paris (Oregon); and Milagros Gavieres (Hawaii). The Consortium also acknowledges the special contributions of Elsie Gee for her organizational ability, high energy, constructive criticism, and perseverance in the planning, conduct, and management of the study, Carolyn Arnold, Mark Phillips, and Christine Baker for data analysis, Becky McReynolds for a broad range of editorial work, and Raquel Castillo, Patricia Ferman, and Peter Grace for coordination of document production.

Table of Contents

Page

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE v

ACKNOWLEDGMENT xv

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

- Description of the Study. 1
  - Sample Selection 1
  - Part I 3
  - Part II. 5

CHAPTER TWO: MACRO-LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF PART II SITES . . . 11

- Macro-level Data Collection 11
  - Data Sources 12
  - Philosophical/Theoretical Underpinnings for the Research Construct 12
  - Data Collection Procedures 14
- Consortium Site Descriptions. 15
- School District Data. 17
  - Total Enrollment 17
  - Ethnic Composition of the Student Population 18
  - Language Characteristics of the Staff. 21
- Community Data. 23
  - Characteristics of the Target School Neighborhoods. 23
- Bilingual Education Program Data. 35
  - Years in Operation and Reason for Existence. 35
  - Funding. 36
  - Language Assessment Procedures 40
  - Policies and Goals 41
- Summary 44

CHAPTER THREE: DESCRIPTION OF PART II STUDENTS. 49

- Sample Selection. 49
- Description of the Sample 50
- Language Characteristics of Students. 52
- Enrollment of Language Minority Students. 55
- Instructional Participation of Students 55
- Summary 57

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

CHAPTER FOUR: DESCRIPTION OF PART II TEACHERS 61

Characteristics of the Teachers 62
Teachers' First Language 62
Years of Teaching Experience 63
Professional Training. 64
Language Use During Instruction. 66
View of Entry/Exit Criteria 68
Site 01: New York 68
Site 02: Florida. 69
Site 03: Texas. 70
Site 04: Arizona. 71
Site 05: California 73
Site 07: Illinois 73
Site 08: Oregon 74
Site 09: Hawaii 75
Philosophy of Bilingual Education 76
Site 01: New York 76
Site 02: Florida. 76
Site 03: Texas. 78
Site 04: Arizona. 78
Site 05: California 79
Site 07: Illinois 81
Site 08: Oregon 81
Site 09: Hawaii 82
Perception of Program Effectiveness 83
Site 01: New York 83
Site 02: Florida. 84
Site 03: Texas. 85
Site 04: Arizona. 86
Site 05: California 86
Site 07: Illinois 87
Site 08: Oregon 88
Site 09: Hawaii 89
Summary 89
Characteristics of the Teachers. 89
View of Entry/Exit Criteria. 91
Philosophy of Bilingual Education. 92
Perceptions of Progam Effectiveness. 94

REFERENCES 95

List of Tables

Table		Page
i	Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part I	ix
ii	Research Documents and Reports for SBIF Study: Part II.	xii
1	Summary of Site Characteristics for Part I and Part II of the SBIF Study.	2
2	Constructs, Research Questions, and Data Sources for Part I of the Study.	4
3	Enrollments of Part II School Districts	18
4	Ethnolinguistic Composition of Part II School Districts	20
5	Family and Related Data: Site 03	26
6	Allocation of Funds for Bilingual Education at Site 02 for 1981-82	37
7	Funding for Bilingual Education in the San Francisco Unified School District for 1980-81.	39
8	SBIF Part II Sample Description	51
9	Language Characteristics of SBIF Part II Student Sample	53
10	Enrollment of Language Minority Students in Part II Classes	56
11	Instructional Participation Types for Students in Part II Classes	58
12	Native Languages of Part II Teacher Sample.	62
13	Years of Teaching Experience of Part II Sample.	63
14	Years of Bilingual Teaching Experience of Part II Sample	64
15	Extent of Professional Training of Part II Teachers	65

List of Tables (continued)

Table Page

16 Extent of Bilingual Professional Training of Part II Teachers 65

17 Languages Used in Instruction by Part II Teacher Sample 66

18 Class Time Spent in Non-English Instruction Reported by Teachers 67

19 Class Time Spent on ESL Reported by Teachers. 67

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general description of the entire Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) study to serve as a basis for the remainder of this volume. The data reported in this document, however, will be from only Part II of the study.

Description of the Study

The SBIF descriptive study was composed of two phases: Part I proposed to identify and describe features of bilingual instructional settings found to have significant consequences for limited English proficient (LEP) students; Part II focused on verification of those features and consequences.

Sample Selection

Sites for both Part I and Part II of the SBIF study were selected by a purposive rather than a probability sampling procedure. The factors considered in choosing the study sites recognized a need to obtain: a variety of language groups; diversity of geographic representation; variability in bilingual education program characteristics; a balance of language characteristics; and a mix of urban and rural communities. The design of the study sought bilingual education programs that varied in procedures, structure, size, and proportion of LEP students.

The sites and their characteristics in terms of selection factors are presented in Table 1.

For Part I, the study classrooms were selected by a combination of values-oriented (subjective) and criterion-oriented (objective) processes. The values-oriented process was based on the nomination of classes as successful bilingual instructional settings by bilingual education constituents. The criterion-oriented process included a basic set of necessary criteria that each class had to meet. These criteria were: (a) that at least 30 percent of the students be limited English proficient; (b) that instruction be bilingual; and (c) that bilingual instruction had been offered for at least three years.

For Part II, some classes were added that did not meet these criteria in order to test the replicability of Part I findings in other settings.

Table 1

Summary of Site Characteristics for Part I

and Part II of the SBIF Study

SITE CHARACTERISTICS		SITES								
		SITE 01	SITE 02	SITE 03	SITE 04	SITE 05	SITE 06	SITE 07	SITE 08	SITE 09
PARTICIPATION IN STUDY	Part I	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	Part II	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS										
Hispanic (Mexican)				X			X	X	X	
Hispanic (Puerto Rican)		X						X		
Hispanic (Cuban)			X				X	X		
Asian (Chinese)						X	X			
Asian (Ilokano)										X
Asian (Other Languages)						X	X		X	X
Native American (Navajo)					X					
GEORGRAPHIC REPRESENTATIONS										
North East		X								
South East			X							
Mid West								X		
North West									X	
South West				X	X					
West						X	X			
Pacific Basin										X
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS										
Variety in Programmatic Response to LMS		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Title VII Programs		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Non-Title VII Programs		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SITE LOCATION										
Urban		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Rural					X					X
SIZE OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS										
50 or More Classes Available		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Grades K through 12 Available		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VARIABILITY IN THE PROPORTION OF LMS		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MINIMUM PROGRAM EXPERIENCE 3 TO 5 YEARS		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Part I

In the proposal for the SBIF study it was argued that significant instructional features were more likely to appear in classrooms nominated as successful by their constituents. Therefore, classrooms and schools identified as successful bilingual instructional settings served as the focus of Part I.

In its first year, the study addressed research questions that related to and grew from six sets of research constructs. These constructs and questions, together with the data sources used, appear in Table 2.

Data for the study were drawn from sources both outside and inside the classrooms. Two sources of information outside the immediate classrooms were: (a) the success indicators for bilingual instruction as described by constituents (parents, teachers, students and administrators) and their consequences for LEPs; and (b) the macro-level context of the schools, school districts, and communities in the study.

The majority of the data for Part I were obtained from sources inside the classrooms. These classroom data were collected from January to June of the 1980-81 school year and included two levels of activities. During Level 1, several kinds of data were collected for the sample classrooms at each of the sites. During Level 2, one or two classrooms at every site were studied intensively in order to produce an ecological case study for each of those classes. These two data collection levels are described below.

Level 1. For the 58 classrooms of the Part I study sample, Level 1 data collection focused on four major areas. These were: (a) the organizational structure of the classroom in terms of the language of instruction, the subject being taught, the work load and its composition, the degree of cooperation among students, student options, the nature of teachers' evaluations, and the interdependency of any of these factors; (b) the allocation of time by content, language of instruction, instructor (e.g., whether teacher or aide), language of materials, individual students, and type of activity; (c) teacher variables such as attitudes, expectations, and sense of efficacy (obtained primarily through open-ended interviews); and (d) student variables of instructional participation styles and academic learning time (with an emphasis on performance in the basic skills of reading, language arts, and math).

Level 2. The ecological case studies that resulted from the Level 2 data collection were designed to obtain richer, more in-depth information for nine of the classrooms observed during Level 1. Data collection at this level consisted of (a) teacher curriculum interviews, and (b) student and teacher interviews and observations for three to four instructional events.

Prior to the observations, the teachers were interviewed about their instructional goals, about the instructional and social operation

Table 2

Constructs, Research Questions, and Data Sources for Part I of the Study

CONSTRUCTS	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	DATA RESOURCES
Indicators of successful bilingual instructional settings	What features/criteria do various experts among bilingual education constituent groups use in determining that a bilingual instructional setting (school and classroom) is successful? Constituent groups are: bilingual education program directors, principals, teachers, parents, etc. Are success indicators similar or different based on client groups, ethnolinguistic composition of language minority student population, site, level of education (elementary/school, junior high school, senior high school), and school classroom?	Open ended interviews with representatives of various client groups at each of six proposed Part I sites. Bilingual education classroom evidencing success criteria
Macro-level context data	What is the school, community, bilingual education program, and family context within which each of the sample classrooms is nested? What, if any, similarities/differences in the macro-level context exists across sites and classrooms?	Open-ended interviews with school principals, parents, others, at the classroom site. Review of available documents and program plans. Informal observations in community. Project director and data collector knowledge of community
Organizational structure of the classroom	(For each activity structure dimension) what forms are utilized in classrooms in bilingual schooling settings? Do differences on one dimension, e.g., language of instruction, interact with/appear to be related to differences in other dimensions, e.g., student choice?	Narrative descriptions based on in-class observations. General descriptive data obtained during in-class observation.
Allocation of Time	How is time allocated in exemplary bilingual schooling settings by content area, language of instruction, student language characteristics, resources, and category of teaching-learning activity? Does allocation of time differ according to configuration of macro-context levels?	In-class observations using stop-watch and coding sheet.
Teacher Variables	Which, if any, active teaching behaviors do teachers in successful bilingual schooling settings use when teaching reading and math?	Active teaching observation instruments.
	What expectations do teachers in bilingual settings have for Language Minority Students and students who speak the majority language What, if any, similarities/differences in expectations occur across teachers based on teacher's mother tongue, years of teaching in a bilingual education program, professional development related to instruction of Language Minority Students? What sense of efficacy is expressed by teachers? Does efficacy appear to be related to teacher's mother tongue, etc.? (see above) In teacher's opinion, what is intent of instruction? Is intent similar/different depending upon student language, age, subject area?	Curriculum interviews.
	What patterns of interaction, in general, occur between teachers and students in bilingual schooling settings? What work activity and institutional demands are imposed by teachers in the classroom? Are these related to student's ethnolinguistic background, teacher's intent, sense of efficacy, expectations for students? What relationships exist, if any between teacher intent and what the teacher does during instruction?	Narrative description of teacher behavior.
Student Variables	What is the language proficiency in L1 and L2 of the Language Minority Students in each classroom, based on teacher ratings and other data sources?	Teacher ratings of language proficiency; other already available proficiency data.
	What is the Academic Learning Time of Language Minority Students in bilingual instructional settings, by classroom, site, and across site?	Academic Learning Time data. Descriptive narratives of student participation in the classroom.
	What social cognitive understandings do Language Minority Students express regarding instructional demands, teacher authority, distributive justice in application of classroom resources and specific work activity demands?	Social cognitive understanding interviews.
	How do Language Minority Students participate in classroom instructional activities? Is one style of participation more productive for some students than others? What, if any, relationships exist between the Language Minority Student's proficiency, ALT, participation style(s), and/or social cognitive understandings?	Narrative description of student behavior in the classroom. Participation style analysis.

of their classrooms, and about their views of students who functioned successfully in those classrooms.

The instructional events involved these steps: (a) an interview with the teacher to determine the intent of instruction for the particular event; (b) the actual observation of the event with a concurrent focus on the teacher and four target students; (c) a debriefing interview with the teacher to obtain his or her evaluation of the lesson; and (d) a debriefing interview with the individual target students to obtain their understanding of the lesson, their perception of their success at completing the instructional task, and their social cognitive awareness of the classroom system.

Findings. The Part I data collection used a variety of observational strategies that resulted in measures of instructional organization, time allocation to content areas and languages, language use, and student engagement and accuracy in instructional tasks as well as qualitative descriptions of instruction and student participation. Analyses of these data sets separately and in combination provided a description of bilingual instruction.

The instruction by the nominated Part I teachers exhibited five significant features. These were:

1. Congruence of instructional intent, organization and delivery of instruction, and student consequences;
2. Use of active teaching behaviors;
3. Use of the students' native language (L1) and English (L2) for instruction;
4. Integration of English language development with basic skills instruction; and
5. Use of information from the LEP students' home culture.

The first two features could be viewed as characteristic of effective teachers in general. The last three features describe ways in which the teachers of the SBIF study mediated instruction for their limited English proficient students. In mediating instruction, the nominated teachers provided instruction in all subject areas using both English and the LEP students' native language and culture. Thus LEP students were able to develop their English language proficiency as well as progress in academic skills.

Part II

The information obtained during Part I of the SBIF study provided the basis for the verification procedures of Part II. During the 1981-82 school year, Part II attempted to verify:

1. The existence of features identified in the Part I study classrooms in additional bilingual instructional settings.

2. The stability of features and consequences for teachers and students observed during Part I. This approach examined the stability of features among teachers observed in Part I who had new students for Part II as well as the stability of students' progress in English acquisition and academic skills over two school years.

3. The utility of findings from Part I for improving bilingual instructional practice.

4. The compatibility of Part I findings with other, related research.

In order to accomplish these objectives, four verification studies were conducted.

Study I. Verifiability of features and consequences. Initially the intent of this study was to determine if instructional features and the resultant consequences for LEPs identified in Part I classrooms could be recognized (a) in other bilingual classrooms of Part I sites and (b) in bilingual instructional settings for other ethnolinguistic groups. Teacher selection procedures were to be the same for Part II as for Part I; all teachers were to be both bilingual and nominated as among the most successful teachers at each site.

As the study proceeded, the usefulness of extending the issue of verifiability to other instructional settings became more apparent. Thus the criteria for the Part II teacher sample were altered to include teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL), bilingual teachers in general, and teachers in regular instructional programs. This approach allowed the collection of data to answer two questions concerning verifiability:

1. Study I-A: Were significant instructional features and consequences for LEP students indigenous to bilingual instructional settings only for the ethnolinguistic populations studied in Part I, or could they be found in bilingual instructional settings serving other ethnolinguistic groups?

2. Study I-B: Were significant instructional features and consequences for LEP students indigenous only to the bilingual instructional settings nominated as successful, or could they be found in other instructional settings as well?

To answer these questions, two research substudies were conducted concurrently. The substudies were similar, but were conducted with very different samples. The first, Substudy I-A, pursued the original question by focusing on new ethnolinguistic groups at new sites. This substudy represented a partial replication of Part I of the SBIF descriptive study in that guidelines for selection of settings, teachers, and students were identical to the methods used in Part I. Data collection procedures for Part II were also comparable to those for Part I.

Substudy I-B addressed the second research question by studying classrooms at one new site as well as different classrooms at the continuing Part I sites. The teachers of these classrooms constituted a sample of teachers who were (a) bilingual but unnominated; and (b) neither bilingual nor nominated. At the continuing sites, Substudy I-B comprised bilingual settings, ESL settings, and monolingual settings. At the new site, the classrooms were all bilingual education settings.

The fact that some of the Part II study classrooms were unnominated did not necessarily mean that they were unsuccessful. It did, however, indicate that these classrooms were likely to exhibit broader characteristics than the Part I classes.

Study II. Stability of features and consequences/progress of LEPs. This study was intended to answer these questions:

1. Given a new group of students for Part II of the study, did the teachers who were observed in Part I use the same instructional features? Were the consequences for LEPs similar or different?

2. Given a new teacher for Part II, with potentially different instructional features, did the target students from Part I experience similar or different consequences?

The first question was asked in Substudy II-A by concentrating on two teachers at each Part I site who continued into Part II of the study. Previous literature on teaching and instruction has indicated that teaching behavior is not stable from year to year. Institutional conditions (such as class size, required paperwork, or student mobility) and student populations change, presenting different requirements and necessitating adjustments in instruction. In addition, personal pressures may influence an individual teacher's teaching behavior.

Substudy II-A used data collected during both Part I and Part II of the study. These data included narrative descriptions of instruction that were analyzed by the participating teachers, and information on the effectiveness of Part I teachers. This situation provided an unusual opportunity to examine the stability of teachers' instruction.

The second question was responded to in Substudy II-B. For this study, target students observed during the Part I school year were followed to their new classrooms during the Part II school year. Out of a potential of 232 Part I target students, 85 were followed for Part II.

An underlying assumption of bilingual instruction is that a LEP student may be penalized if all instruction is delivered in English. Thus bilingual programs are guided by a desire to provide instruction that both develops the LEP student's English language skills and communicates the concepts of basic skills. Proponents of bilingual education argue that a teacher who can deliver instruction bilingually provides LEP students a better opportunity to learn. Critics of bilingual education, on the other hand, have questioned the lack of empirical evidence equating bilingual instruction with academic achievement.

This controversy formed the basis for this substudy, which represented one of only a few attempts to study LEP students in bilingual programs over time.

Study III. Utility of features and consequences. The utility of the identified significant features of bilingual instruction was an important facet of verification. If the features failed to be useful to bilingual education practitioners, then application of the findings from the SBIF descriptive study would have been problematic at best. Foci of this substudy were not only the significant features and consequences that emerged from Part I of the study but also the analytic strategies used to observe, identify, and interpret students' participation characteristics.

This study was conducted through one- and two-day meetings at each site to which various practitioners (such as bilingual teachers, directors of bilingual instructional programs, bilingual education staff developers, and teacher educators) were invited. These practitioners focused on ways to implement the study information and on the instructional relevance of cultural elements as well as on the utility of the identified features and consequences. The practitioners were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Which of the significant bilingual instructional features identified in Part I appeared promising for improving learning experiences and resolving teachers' concerns for LEPs?

2. In what ways was the information from Part I of the study useful? What features (or consequences) have you used (or observed)? Were they similar to or different from those identified by the study? Were there features from the study you would like to try? What consequences would you expect? Were there features you would not try?

3. How would you apply the information from the study? What research strategies would you employ for other bilingual teachers, monolingual English teachers of LEP students, teacher aides, administrators, bilingual teachers in training, or bilingual educators?

4. When you consider bilingual instruction for LEP students at your school, what elements of the students' culture are important in designing and delivering instruction?

The contributions of the practitioners were synthesized both from a national perspective and from a view relevant to each site.

Study IV. Compatibility with other research. Study IV was designed to determine the compatibility of the significant instructional features and consequences from Part I with other research.

For this study, papers by five recognized researchers were commissioned for presentation at a meeting held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). These papers were the foci for review, reaction, and critique during an all day conference session. Conference participants represented the constituents of bilingual education (e.g., teachers, administrators, teacher educators, researchers, policy makers).

A report for this substudy, consisting of the commissioned papers presented by the invited scholars, is being published as a separate document.

CHAPTER TWO

MACRO-LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF PART II SITES

During Part II of the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) descriptive study, a variety of data were collected from eight sites across the country. As part of this data collection process, each of the participating sites collected data on the wider context in which bilingual instruction was taking place. This macro-level context included the community, the school district, the district's bilingual education program, and the target schools in which the study was conducted. The staff at each site produced a written document that organized and summarized this information (see series of macro context reports in Tables i and ii). This chapter provides an overview and summary of the macro-level contexts of the Part II sites.

Macro-level Data Collection

The bilingual classroom entails an extremely complex instructional system that can be described using a myriad of variables. For the purpose of the SBIF descriptive study, the wide array of possible context variables were separated into two types:

1. Those that existed primarily outside the classroom but that influenced classroom instruction (e.g., skills, attitudes, expectations of students, teachers, and others) and that affected what occurred within the classroom (e.g., the school environment and support system, school district rules and regulations); and

2. Those that existed primarily within the classroom (e.g., ways in which students, teachers, or aides organized for instruction; ways in which institutional demands were interpreted and applied in the teacher-student learning group; how time was allocated; how persons in the instructional setting interacted) and that influenced teacher-student interactions, student participation, and student consequences.

In this study, the first set of variables represented the macro-level context in which instruction occurred, and the latter, the micro-level, or classroom, context. It was clear that both needed to be considered in order to understand fully the sociocultural context in which bilingual instruction took place, and how this may have influenced both instruction and student learning.

The two basic research questions were:

- What were the most salient characteristics of the communities, schools, and bilingual education programs within which the sample classrooms were nested? How did these factors influence bilingual instruction?
- What, if any, similarities or differences in the macro-level context existed across sites?

Data Sources

In order to answer these two basic questions, the macro-level data were organized into four broad areas:

1. School district data, e.g., total enrollment, number and type of schools, characteristics of the student population (grade level, ethnicity, language proficiency), rules for student behavior, and entry/exit criteria for students in bilingual education programs;
2. Community and family related data, e.g., whether urban or rural, the history of language contact between the majority and minority language groups, the uses of L1 and L2 in the community, the number and percentage of recent immigrants, occupations and range of income of family members, and the average formal schooling for parents;
3. Bilingual education program data, e.g., the rationale, philosophical base and model from which the program was developed, the number of years in existence, sources and percentages of funding, the language assessment procedures, state and local entry/exit policies, and the number of students participating in the program; and
4. Sample school and classroom data, e.g., the community in which the sample school was located and its socioeconomic status, a physical description of the school and its surroundings, characteristics of the faculty, principal, traditions, and student population, verbal descriptions of the classrooms, and maps of the school and classrooms.

Philosophical/Theoretical Underpinnings for the Research Construct

Cummins (1977), Fishman (1977) and Paulston (1977) argued that bilingual education programs could not be separated from the sociocultural contexts that gave rise to them. As noted by Cummins (1977), "Bilingual, as well as other school programs, may be considered to be the result of constellations of societal variables rather than independent variables in their own right" (p. 85).

Hence, the combination of (a) the ethnolinguistic backgrounds of the LEPs participating in the SBIF descriptive study, (b) the geographic area in which the students resided, (c) the attitude of the various communities toward factors such as the capabilities and contributions of a particular ethnolinguistic group and the use of their native language, and (d) the special demands of urban or rural living could be expected to result in differences in student and teacher expectations, behaviors, attitudes, skills, and the use of or proficiency in the native or minority language (L1) and English (L2).

Much of the literature that focuses on the social context of bilingual education has been theoretical in nature. The major conclusions of scholars are summarized below.

1. It is important to understand how the educational system is related to the language minority community--whether it is seen as relevant or alien to that community's needs and goals (Spolsky, 1977).

2. Community and parental support is essential to an instructional program's success. For example, witness the Canadian programs, where socioeconomic factors and strong community support are associated with success (Fishman, 1977; Paulston, 1977).

3. Within-group variation, though often overlooked, has important implications for bilingual education program structure and practices (e.g., there are several major distinct Hispanic groups, each of which varies internally according to regional background and language use patterns [Gonzalez, 1977; Spolsky, 1977]).

4. Bilingual education has strong consequences for LEPs in terms of jobs, social status, and political power (Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976; Spolsky, 1977; and Pifer, 1980).

5. Evidence on how bilingual education affects intergroup relations is mixed--while positive attitudes may be engendered by bilingual education (Lambert, Tucker & d'Anglejan, 1973), there also is evidence to the contrary (Steinberg, 1974; Johnson, 1975).

6. Bilingual education is a social issue as well as a linguistic one. Many social factors contribute to both school achievement and second language learning in addition to a person's intellectual capabilities (Paulston, 1977; Fishman, 1977).

Recent research seems to indicate that the effects of sociocultural, political, and personologic factors on bilingualism and bilingual instruction may be subtle but that the consequences of such effects may not be. Theoretical and scholarly work based on research conducted in many countries has identified factors that mediate and intervene in the relationship between causes (independent factors) and consequences (dependent variables) that arise out of minority and majority group language contact. These factors, operating at a societal level, can influence the community, school, family, classroom and individual (e.g., see Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976; Paulston, 1977; Cummins, 1978). Furthermore, these mediational and intervening factors may affect the transactions that take place when one generation passes its cultural heritage to the next (Nieves-Squires & Goodrich, 1980).

Investigating the consequences of majority and minority group contact resulting from social, historical, and educational factors at the societal level is a very complex task. In terms of LEPs, these consequences have different time frames involving immediate or long-term consequences such as cultural transmission, attitudes, and vertical mobility (Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976; Paulston, 1977; Nieves-Squires & Goodrich, 1980). The macro-level context data were derived in part by consideration of these issues.

The macro-level context variables, then, had two major functions with respect to the bilingual education classrooms in this study: first, as descriptors of the general environment in which the sample classrooms, teachers, and students existed; and second, as influencers of events in the classrooms. The second function may have occurred through such variables as school district rules and regulations, ethnolinguistic group behavior norms, classroom rules and behavior norms, neighborhood environment, school environment, or family context. Thus the macro-level context represented information on societal, community, school, family, and individual factors that mediated or influenced instructional features and student consequences in bilingual instructional settings.

Data Collection Procedures

As mentioned above, in order to collect data, macro-level context variables were grouped into these four categories: (a) school district data, (b) community and family-related data, (c) bilingual education program data, and (d) data describing the sample schools and classrooms.

Data were collected from a number of sources using a variety of procedures. Unstructured interviews were conducted with bilingual education project directors, bilingual education resource teachers, other teachers, parents, and members of the community at each site. Demographic data (population figures, ethnolinguistic composition, etc.) were culled from city, state, or school district documents and publications. Published plans of the bilingual education program and school district were reviewed. In several instances, observations were conducted around the school sites and in the community as an added source of data. Knowledge about the community already possessed by the principal investigator, project director, and staff at each site further provided useful insights and perceptions.

Data were collected over the span of the 1981-82 and 1982-83 school years. This allowed for inclusion of information from each school and classroom. For example, until teachers were interviewed as a part of data collection for classroom-level variables, information concerning the characteristics of the bilingual teachers in the study was not readily available. In addition, in the course of data collection, data collectors and project directors became frequent-enough visitors to classrooms and schools that school personnel felt increasingly comfortable talking with them. This naturally resulted in the opportunity to obtain richer information, in turn leading to deeper understanding or clarification of information previously gathered.

Consortium Site Descriptions

Each of the eight Consortium sites of Part II of the SBIF descriptive study provided a different regional and ethnolinguistic perspective. As the brief site descriptions that follow show, the geographic locations of the sites allowed considerable diversity in ethnicity, demography, language and culture. Other macro-level data are presented in greater detail later in this document.

The majority of the sites examined schools in large metropolitan centers: New York, Miami, El Paso, San Francisco, Oakland, Chicago and Honolulu. The Salem, Oregon, site offered a smaller, but still urban setting. Isolated rural areas and predominantly agricultural communities were represented in the Navajo Nation site of Arizona and in vicinities of Hawaii. Five sites focused on three different Hispanic populations: Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican. While all Spanish-speaking, these three groups demonstrate important dialectal and cultural differences. One site looked at Chinese Americans who spoke Cantonese, and another site at recently arrived Vietnamese refugees. The last site observed Filipino immigrants who spoke Ilokano.

The New York site focused on a Puerto Rican community in the borough of Manhattan. This neighborhood was the earliest immigrant settlement for Puerto Ricans in the U.S., and was the place of settlement for most of the Puerto Rican immigrants who came during the early part of the 20th century. By 1940, 70 percent of New York's 61,000 Puerto Ricans lived in this community. However, a greater movement of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland after World War II more than quadrupled the size of this immigrant community and brought about its dispersal to new areas. The area was still an important enclave in New York, but the thrust of the immigration was more diverse. Much of the daily business was conducted bilingually.

In Florida, the Cuban and Cuban American ethnolinguistic group was studied. While Dade County had been the arrival and settling point for a wide variety of immigrants from all over the world, within recent years the influx of Cuban immigrants was particularly great. In the period from April 1980 to June 1981, about 125,000 Cubans entered the United States at Miami. The research staff in Florida conducted their study in an area where large numbers of Cubans had concentrated. In this community, too, most business was conducted bilingually.

The Mexican American population of El Paso was the focus of study in Texas. El Paso, situated on the Mexican border, was socially, culturally, and economically linked to Ciudad Juarez, its sister city across the Rio Grande in Mexico. Together, these cities comprised a large metropolitan area of over 1 million people. The central city area of El Paso, where the sample schools for the study study were located, was nearly 75 percent Spanish-surnamed or Spanish-speaking. Of the total population of El Paso, 58.1 percent was Spanish-surnamed. Because of the close proximity of the two cities, thousands of people crossed the border on a daily basis in both directions, making El Paso-Ciudad Juarez a truly international metropolitan area. Much of the private and government business in El Paso was conducted bilingually.

The Navajo Nation, where the Native American site for the SBIF descriptive study was located, was the largest tribe of Indians in the U.S. whose people spoke their native language. The Navajo Nation consisted of approximately 16 million acres, or 23,574 square miles, extending over the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. The population density was about six persons per square mile in contrast to the national average of 55 persons per square mile. There were no major urban areas on the Reservation. Numerous small communities containing only a trading post or a school were dispersed throughout. A large proportion of the Navajo population engaged in grazing and livestock-related activities as its main means of subsistence, so that many persons lived in remote areas far from educational facilities, social services, and shopping. Per capita income on the Reservation had risen in the last few years, but still remained at less than one fourth of the national average.

At the San Francisco-Oakland site, the focus of attention was on the Chinese American communities in that area. The Bay Area was the focal point of Chinese and other Asian populations in the U.S. Fully 35 percent of all Asian Americans lived in California, many of them around San Francisco and Oakland. The history of the Chinese in this area dated to the mid-19th century when thousands of Chinese immigrated to the U.S. in order to work on the railroads. Despite years of economic and social discrimination, the Chinese persisted; at the time of data collection they constituted nearly 10 percent of the population. Most of the Chinese population was concentrated in the overcrowded Chinatown areas of San Francisco and Oakland. Since the immigration laws were revised in 1965 allowing more Asians, the numbers of immigrants and refugees had increased dramatically. In recent years, large numbers of Chinese from Hong Kong, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos had immigrated to the Bay Area. From 1970 to 1980, the population of Asian and Pacific Americans in California increased 140 percent.

Both Hispanic and Vietnamese ethnic groups were studied at the Salem, Oregon, site. Historically, the immigration of various minorities (primarily Mexican, Chinese, Japanese and Black) to Oregon was directly related to mining, ranching, agriculture, lumber and transportation. After World War II, these minorities were joined by Russians, Cubans, and Indochinese refugees. Since 1975, the number of Indochinese in Oregon had increased 14.5 percent. The Hispanics, on the other hand, were longtime residents; they represented 50 to 65 percent of all minorities in Salem. Unlike Hispanics in other areas of the U.S., the Spanish-speaking minorities in Oregon tended to settle in small rural towns. The Indochinese spread out into low-income urban areas.

The Hawaii site included four school districts on the island of Oahu that served high proportions of Filipino students with the native language of Ilokano. The 1980 census set the ethnically diverse population of Hawaii at 964,691, with Filipinos constituting the third largest racial group (13.9 percent). The Filipinos were among the most recent ethnic groups to migrate to Hawaii and, overall, occupied the lower levels of the state's social and economic life. Their movement to Hawaii began in the early 1900s when sugar plantation owners, whose supply of Chinese and Japanese laborers was reduced by new, restrictive immigration laws, began recruiting Filipinos. From 1907 to 1937, almost 120,000 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii. Preliminary figures for 1981 showed that roughly 62 percent of Hawaii's 7600 immigrants that year were from the Philippines.

School District Data

District-level data are of considerable importance in describing the broader context for bilingual education, since the characteristics of the school district may determine the more general organizational structures in which principals, teachers, and students operate in the conduct of bilingual education. The data collected from the sites were summarized and are presented here with regard to: (a) total enrollment, (b) ethnic composition of the student population, and (c) language characteristics of the staff.

Total Enrollment

The total student populations of the participating school districts ranged from 272 to 224,580. These figures are presented in Table 3.

The disparity in sites was apparent in the differences in district enrollments. The rural nature of the Navajo site, for example, was reflected in relatively small numbers of students. Among the urban sites, the differences seemed to be due more to the organization of the respective city governments than to local population figures. The school district in which the New York sample schools were located, for instance, had a total enrollment of only 12,720, while El Paso's was 60,724. School District #4 in New York, however, was one of 32 school districts in the city, while El Paso's was the only district. The degree to which school systems can be centralized was evident in the case of Dade County Schools in Miami, where 224,580 students were under the jurisdiction of one administration. The school districts of three of the sites, El Paso, San Francisco, and Oakland, were quite similar in number, ranging from 50,000 to 60,000 students served.

Table 3

Enrollments of Part II School Districts

Site	School District	Enrollment
NY 01	District #4	12,720
FL 02	Dade County	224,580
TX 03	El Paso	60,724
AZ 04	Slanted Rock	3,028
	Gallup	1,757
	Rocky Mesa[a]	501
	Truchas[a]	272
CA 05	San Francisco	57,377
	Oakland	49,825
OR 08	Salem	23,054
HI 09	Central Oahu	31,619
	Honolulu	38,178
	Windward Oahu	19,696
	Leeward Oahu	29,593

Note. California Site 06 from Part I was not included in the second year of the study. To avoid confusion, no Part II site was designated as 06.

[a] Not part of any district.

Ethnic Composition of the Student Population

Of prime importance in a study of bilingual education is the ethnicity of the student population in the target schools. For instance, Spanish-speaking students in a school with 20 percent Spanish-speakers most likely would experience a different type of bilingual education than would those in a school in which almost all the students spoke Spanish.

As can be seen in Table 4, there was a dramatic contrast in the ethnic compositions of the school districts across the eight sites, although each site included a significant number of the target ethnolinguistic group.

The focus of the New York site was on a Puerto Rican ethnolinguistic group. Accordingly, the student population of the district was over 56 percent Hispanic. Blacks made up 35.9 percent of that student group and Whites 7.2 percent.

In Florida, the target group was Cuban or Cuban American. The total school district population was fairly closely divided among Whites (31.0 percent), Hispanics (38.2 percent), and Blacks (30.8 percent). These figures, however, were for all of the Dade County schools. Since the three target schools were located in predominantly Hispanic neighborhoods, their student populations were 95.7, 90.5, and 38.8 percent Hispanic.

The El Paso, Texas, public schools served a population that was primarily Hispanic and White. The ethnolinguistic group studied at this site was Mexican or Mexican American and constituted 69 percent of the district's enrollment. About 27 percent of the students were White, about 5 percent were Black or another minority. Here again the neighborhoods, and thus the target schools in which the study was conducted, were almost all Hispanic. The Hispanic concentration in the four study schools was 97.1 percent, 99.2 percent, 74.5 percent, and 49.4 percent.

Navajos were the target ethnolinguistic group at the Navajo Nation in Arizona. Two school districts, a demonstration school, and a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding school participated in the study. The student population in all of the sample schools was 95 to 100 percent Navajo.

In the California site, Cantonese-speaking Chinese were studied. In the San Francisco school district, the ethnic composition was extremely diverse, although the sample schools again were located in areas composed predominantly of the target group. Throughout the San Francisco district, Asians represented 30.0 percent of the student population. Although the ethnic composition of the Oakland school district was primarily Black (67.8 percent), the target school drew most of its students from a largely Chinese-speaking area. Asians constituted about 7.8 percent of Oakland's student population.

The student population of the Salem (Oregon) school district, though predominantly White (92.8 percent), had a diversity of minority groups. The total district enrollment in 1981-82 was 23,054. Of these students, 553 (or 2.4 percent) were Asian and 735 (or 3.2 percent) were Hispanic. Alaskan, Russian, and Black ethnic groups each represented less than 1 percent of the enrollment. Surveys by the district indicated that the 1982-83 enrollment in all district bilingual programs would be 1,221.

The Hawaii state school system served an ethnically very diverse constituency; about 67 percent of the population belonged to minority groups. Of the 10,600 students identified in public schools as non-native English-speaking, the greatest number (3,137) was Ilokano. The next largest group was Samoan (1,759), followed by Vietnamese (718). In total, 40 languages other than English were idenfied as spoken by students in the Hawaiian public schools. In three of the eight target schools, students of Filipino ancestry made up the majority of the

Table 4

Ethnolinguistic Composition of Part II School Districts

	Percentages					
Site	White	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Black	Other
NY 01						
District #4	7.2	56.5	0.2	.05	35.9	
FL 02						
Dade County	31.0	38.2			30.8	
TX 03						
El Paso	27.0	69.0			5.0	
AZ 04						
Slanted Rock				95.0[a]		4.9
Gallup				95.0		
Rocky Mesa[b]				100.0		
Truchas[b]				100.0		
CA 05						
San Francisco	17.1	17.2	30.0	0.6	23.0	12.0
Oakland	13.9	9.2	7.8	0.8	67.8	
OR 08						
Salem	92.8	3.2	2.4	0.6[c]	0.9	.03[d]
HI 09						
Central Oahu	36.5	2.3	52.6[e]	0.4	4.8	6.5
Honolulu	14.2	1.1	76.4	0.2	0.6	7.6
Windward Oahu	31.9	1.7	58.4	0.2	1.4	6.5
Leeward Oahu	17.7	2.6	72.8	0.2	1.3	5.3

---

[a] Native American group at Site 04 is entirely Navajo.

[b] Not part of any district.

[c] Native American group here and in Hawaii site includes Alaskans.

[d] Other here represents Russian.

[e] Asian percentages in Hawaii include these Filipino percentages: Central, 18.5; Honolulu, 18.2; Windward, 7.2; and Leeward, 27.

school's populations, representing between 65 and 83 percent of the student population.

Language Characteristics of the Staff

The way in which instruction is delivered in a bilingual education program will depend to some degree on the language abilities and language use of the instructors. It was therefore of interest to investigate whether teachers and paraprofessionals in the classrooms at the various sites were:

1. bilingual, i.e., equally proficient in L1 (the minority language) and L2 (English);
2. more proficient in L2 than L1;
3. more proficient in L1 than L2; or
4. monolingual in L1 or L2.

The information available regarding staff language characteristics varied from site to site. Nevertheless, a picture emerged showing that the professional staff at each site was composed, at a minimum, of a high proportion of L1-speakers as well as proficient English-speakers. In other words, the possibility existed at each site for LEPs to be exposed to the proficient use of both their native language and English.

At the New York site, the school district reported that 100 percent of the bilingual education administrators were bilingual. Nearly half of the classroom teachers were also bilingual, but only 20 percent of the classroom aides were equally proficient in L1 and L2. About half of the teachers were more proficient in English than in Spanish, and less than 5 percent were Spanish-dominant. In contrast, fully 80 percent of the paraprofessionals were classified as more proficient in Spanish than English.

At the Dade County schools in Florida, the home language and dominant language characteristics of the teachers were unavailable on a countywide basis. However, some data concerning the ethnic composition of the staff were obtained. In October 1981, when 38.2 percent of the students were Hispanic, the teaching staff was 57.6 percent White, 27.0 percent Black, and 15.1 percent Hispanic. The bilingual program historically had made heavy use of teacher aides. In 1980-81, 29.2 percent of teacher aides were Hispanic, twice the percentage for teachers. In 1981-82, the percentage of Hispanic teacher aides had dropped to 21.2 percent, reflecting cuts in the bilingual program.

In the El Paso public schools, a policy had been established by which teachers were assigned to schools on the basis of the degree of concentration of LEPs at each school. This policy served to maintain a higher proportion of bilingual teachers in those schools with large Spanish populations. For instance, in a school with only one bilingual section, one bilingual teacher was assigned. In schools with six sections and a high concentration of LEPs, four bilingual teachers were assigned for every two monolingual teachers. Where there was a lower concentration of LEPs, the ratio was two bilingual teachers to every four monolingual teachers.

On the Navajo Nation, it was reported that most of the teachers of Navajo ethnicity were in fact bilingual in English and Navajo. There was considerable variation in the number of Navajos on the different school staffs, however. In Slanted Rock, there were 61 teachers certified out of 196. It appeared that the majority of certified staff members were balanced bilinguals. Instructional aides who were studying to become certified tended to be balanced bilinguals, those who were not taking courses tended to be Navajo dominant. In Gallup, 16 teachers and 58 aides were Navajo, 88 teachers were White. For the 1980-81 school year, Rocky Mesa Demonstration School had 20 teachers who were Navajo, and 15 who were Anglo. The nonprofessional staff was 98 percent Navajo. The Truchas grades 1 to 8 employed 19 certified teachers. Of these, 15 were Navajo, 1 was of a different Native American group, and 2 were Anglo. All aides were Navajo, including four who were in the Navajo Teacher Education Program at the University of New Mexico.

By California state law, all bilingual classroom teachers were required to be certified in the L1 language (or obtain a waiver while obtaining certification). In the San Francisco classes studied, there were bilingual teaching arrangements in which bilingual and monolingual teachers were teamed to teach the same group of students on alternate days or alternate half days. Monolingual teachers usually had an aide who was dominant in the students' native language. One school used fully bilingual teachers in self-contained classes, but that school was specifically for newly arrived immigrant students who usually were transferred to regular schools after one year. In the Oakland study schools, all teachers of bilingual classes were Chinese and English bilinguals in self-contained classes with instructional aides who were more proficient in Chinese than in English.

At Salem, 50 percent of the instructional staff in the bilingual program was bilingual in Spanish and English. While none of the certified teachers spoke an Indochinese language, 17 instructional aides proficient in those languages were on the staff. Sixteen other aides spoke Spanish.

In order to provide statewide bilingual education services, the state of Hawaii used a total of 141 bilingual full-time teachers, 148 bilingual part-time teachers, and 41 aides during the 1981-82 school year. Another 125 full-time teachers were designated as ESL staff. The district's full-time and part-time bilingual teachers in combination spoke the following languages (in addition to English): Ilokano, Tagalog, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Visayan, Samoan, Lao, Thai, Tongan, Pangasinan.

Community Data

Recent research has indicated that various aspects of the society in which children live can have significant consequences for bilingual instruction and learning. These may be social, psychological, or educational (cognitive). Social consequences may be manifested in the ways in which teachers and peers treat the language minority student. Friendship networks based on language or ethnic group affiliation may mean that a language minority child will become an isolated child as well. Psychological consequences might be seen in the way the student thinks of himself or herself. Children may develop negative self-concepts if their ethnolinguistic group is treated as low status and becomes a basis for discrimination. Negative educational consequences, too, may result if the education system does not take into consideration children who do not speak the majority language; if the language of instrution is only the majority language, then language minority children may be left behind academically.

The macro-level context of community was included in the study so that aspects of the students' environments could be examined. As has been argued (Cummins, 1977; Fishman, 1977; Paulston, 1977), bilingual education programs cannot be separated from the socio-cultural context in which they operate and in which they develop.

Characteristics of the Target School Neighborhoods

At each of the Consortium sites in Part II of the study, data were collected to give an overall picture of the community in which the target students lived. The narratives developed at each site covered a specific series of topics. These included:

- o General characteristics of the target school's service area or neighborhood, such as whether it was rural or urban;
- o History of the language contact between the majority and minority ethnolinguistic groups represented in the community;
- o Use of majority and minority languages in the community, whether in business, government, churches, or the media;
- o The geographical proximity of the community to other centers of the same or other minority group populations;
- o The presence in the community of social action groups, cultural or religious associations; and
- o The numbers and percentages of recent immigrants.

Data on these topics were collected and woven into a narrative report for every site. Because of the variety of the study settings, and the types of information available, each report differed in content and style. A summary narrative of each site report is presented here.

Site 01: New York. All sample classrooms in the New York City site were located in School District #4 in Manhattan. The general area in which the schools were located is called East Harlem or Spanish Harlem.

This community was the earliest place of settlement for Puerto Ricans coming to the United States during the first decades of the 20th century. The movement of Puerto Ricans into the area was so great that by 1940 about 70 percent of New York's 61,000 Puerto Ricans lived there. The mass movement of Puerto Ricans to the U.S. mainland in the post World War II era, however, more than quadrupled the size of this immigrant community and brought about their dispersal to other areas of the country.

The community's overwhelmingly Hispanic ethnic composition was reflected in its small businesses, as well as its religious and social organizations. The signs on the store fronts attested to the Spanish influence of the neighborhood. The language heard most often in the area was, of course, Spanish.

According to a recent Manhattan Community Planning Survey, 143,000 people lived in District #4. This same survey reported that only 18.8 percent of the area's Puerto Rican population above age 18 had completed four years of high school. Citywide, the statistics were equally alarming. There, only 24 percent of the Puerto Ricans had finished high school compared with 43.3 percent of the Blacks and 44.1 percent of the Whites.

East Harlem was an area of extreme poverty and unemployment. The unemployment rate for all men was at 41 percent; for men ages 18 to 25, 60 percent. The rate for women was 74 percent. According to New York City Human Resources Administration records, 80 percent of those employed were unskilled or semiskilled. In the area of which the school district was a part, 33.7 percent of the population was on welfare in 1977, the third highest rate in the city of New York.

Site 02: Florida. The three target schools in Dade County were located near downtown Miami in neighborhoods of Hispanic, and particularly Cuban, concentration. Spanish was the home language of the great majority of residents in the area and was widely used for signs, for business, and for church services.

Although the communities served by two of the three participating schools were of below average socioeconomic status, they could not have been described as ghettos. The housing consisted mainly of modern suburban homes and small apartment buildings, and a large majority of the heads of households were employed. Most residents were lower middle class. The ethnic composition of these areas had shifted dramatically since the early 1960's. Following the Cuban Revolution, thousands of Cubans began to pour into these communities, mainly because they offered relatively low rents. The changes followed a classic pattern of ethnic succession, with non-Hispanics moving out and being replaced predominantly by Cubans. This process took place over a decade and without overt conflict.

The community surrounding the third school was quite different both geographically and socially. Located furthest from the downtown area, this community was more ethnically diverse. The Hispanic presence here was newer and less pronounced.

The urban area overall had encountered severe social problems. These included environmental difficulties brought about by rapid population growth, increases in violent crime, and the expansion of a large drug smuggling industry. Existing problems were exacerbated by the arrival of tens of thousands of Cubans, and thousands more Haitians. Conflicts among ethnic groups, in particular confrontations between Whites and Blacks, erupted at one point in a major race riot in which 18 persons were killed and property worth millions of dollars was damaged.

A second major manifestation of ethnic conflict--this time centering on the issue of language--occurred in 1980. At that time a citizen's group led a fight against Dade County's policies toward bilingualism, which they argued contributed to higher tax rates. By a vote of 3 to 2, legislation was approved that prohibited the county from spending funds to promote any language but English. In 1981 a new county official attempted to have medical, emergency, and tourist information exempted from the ordinance, but that issue was unresolved at the time of this study. The consequences of the ordinance appeared to have been minor. Demographic trends, continued Hispanic immigration, new tourism and business from Latin America, and growing economic and political power of the Cubans seemed to be outweighing the effects of the legislation. In fact, it was apparently widely recognized that bilingual individuals had an edge over monolinguals in the local labor market.

There were seven Spanish language radio stations, one Spanish language television station, one Spanish language daily newspaper and a proliferation of minor Spanish language newspapers. The area's major English daily also published a daily Spanish language supplement. Spanish language magazines, movies, theater, and bookstores also were available.

Site 03: Texas. The four schools in the El Paso study sample were located in the central city area. Hinojosa, Romero, and Blandinas elementary schools were within a few blocks of the Rio Grande River and the metropolitan border community of Juarez, Mexico. Lomas Elementary was the only school at some distance from the border crossing, but it was still in the urban community. The population of the central city area where the schools were located was 72.3 percent Spanishsurnamed or Spanish-speaking. The total Spanish-speaking population in the city was 58.1 percent. Lomas Elementary was in the only community where the Spanish-speaking population was a low 12.5 percent. Community data are reported below by schools. Income, housing, and approximate population summaries are displayed on Table 5.

Table 5

Family and Related Data: Site 03

School[a] Area	Census Tracts Numbers[b]	1970 Median Income (Average)	Approx. Housing Units (1979)	Approx. Population (1979)
Lomas	3.01, 3.02	$7,282.	2,165	6,777
Romero	17, 18, 19	$3,613.	1,283	3,613
Hinojosa	19, 20	$3,564.	1,339	3,891
Blandinas	29, 30, 31	$5,958.	1,346	4,949

[a] School names are pseudonyms.
[b] School areas encompass two or more census tracts.

Source. El Paso Business Location Information: El Paso Fact Book 1979-80 (pp. 8-11)

Hinojosa School Community Data. Spanish was the language spoken by the vast majority of adults in the Hinojosa community. A preliminary school survey indicated that only 3 to 5 percent of the parents who sent their children to Hinojosa School spoke English. Interviews with the principal and vice-principal revealed an absence of any social action groups, or cultural or religious associations at this school.

Approximately 90 percent of the adults in the community were considered unskilled or semiskilled. A preliminary school survey, conducted in the spring of 1981, indicated that approximately 70 percent of the parents had completed only two to three years of schooling in Mexico. No additional schooling was indicated.

Data on length of residence in the U.S. for community residents were not available. However, 80 percent of the school children's parents were resident aliens living in the U.S. and 40 percent of the students attending Hinojosa School were counted as resident aliens.

Romero School Community Data. Spanish was spoken by most residents in the Romero School community. La Compania Para Preservar El Barrio and the Comite Civico Democratico were active in civic events such as maintaining buildings of historic value. The Boys Club promoted athletic, cultural, and craft activities. A library, swimming pool, and gym were provided at the Armendariz Center. A Catholic church provided youth athletic activities. A religious youth center provided religious, social, and athletic activities. Another center provided a job bank and laborers' information service to the community.

Preliminary school survey data did not identify the occupations of parents. However, the adults' average level of formal schooling was about the fourth grade. Most parents were resident aliens with an average length of residence in the U.S. of of roughly six to seven years.

Blandinas School Community Data. About 80 percent of the adults in the Blandinas community spoke Spanish at home. English and Spanish were spoken by those who were native-born. Spanish was frequently spoken in social and commercial environments.

Social action groups were devoted to athletic and recreational activities. Youth recreation programs included baseball and soccer. Organizations such as the Delta Recreation Center, Boys Club, and City League were involved in youth recreational activities. Local police volunteers organized a summer baseball team here. Our Lady of the Light, a Catholic church group, provided religious and social activities for community residents.

Approximately 20 percent of the parents with school-age children lived on welfare. The remaining 80 percent were factory workers, primarily employed to sew clothing. About 50 percent of the adults were high school graduates and of these about 7 percent had some schooling from vocational institutions or community colleges. The remaining 50 percent of community adults were recent immigrants from Mexico. Length of residence varied from two to three years for recent immigrants from Mexico.

Lomas School Community Data. Approximately 80 percent of the adults who sent children to Lomas School spoke some Spanish. About 50 percent of these parents spoke Spanish almost exclusively. Both Spanish and English were regularly heard in local business establishments such as food markets and dry goods shops.

No social action, cultural or religious associations were identified by the principal at this school. This community experienced a high turnover of residents. For example, 30 percent of the parents were employed at a military base in the community; length of residence for these families ranged from two months to two years. Twenty percent of the parents were on welfare and living in low-cost housing that had been recently developed in this neighborhood. The majority of this group consisted of single mothers with school-age children. The remaining 50 percent of the adult population was employed as skilled laborers.

From 40 to 50 percent of the parents in the community had completed high school. Another 30 to 35 percent had not completed high school, but had some formal schooling varying from 1 to 11 years. The remaining 10 to 15 percent of the adults had had no formal schooling.

Most adults in the area were U.S.-born with the exception of about 5 percent who were recently arrived Mexican immigrants. The U.S. residency of these immigrants varied from a few months to five years. Military families lived in this community for a maximum of six years.

El Paso residents had a fairly large choice of Spanish-language media. There were two Spanish-language radio stations in El Paso and 17 English-language stations. The city of Juarez had 14 Spanish-language stations. Television Channel 2 from Mexico City was available to El Paso viewers without cable, as were several Juarez stations. There were at least three major Juarez newspapers that circulated in El Paso.

Much private and government business within El Paso was conducted bilingually. Social service forms, for example, were written in both Spanish and English. It was common for banks and other offices to use Spanish in their correspondence. Thus, Spanish was utilized to a great extent throughout the city, in both written and oral, formal and informal contexts.

Site 04: Arizona. The Navajo Reservation consisted of over 16 million acres extending over Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. There were 148,832 Navajos living there in May 1980. The tribe was one of the few in existence whose population of native language speakers was increasing.

Approximately 75 percent of the reservation was warm, arid, and desertlike. The annual rainfall varied from 5 to 24 inches, and the sparse vegetation included native grasses, pinion and juniper trees, and sagebrush. In the more humid mountainous region, yellow pine, oak, aspen, and fir trees were common. The soil over most of the Navajo Reservation, however, was alkaline and heavily eroded.

Many Navajos still engaged in traditional occupations related to raising livestock. They saw their land and sheep as the only means for survival. There were no urban centers on the Navajo Reservation; instead, numerous small communities, sometimes consisting of only a trading post or a school, were scattered throughout. There was a growing trend, however, for Navajos to move temporarily to the few larger communities for employment or education. Thirteen of these communities had grown up recently, and the total combined populations of of these towns was estimated at 30,000.

The Navajo Nation was divided into five different agencies by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These in turn were divided into districts.

The population density on the reservation was approximately 6 persons per square mile. Most Navajos lived far from educational, social service, health, and shopping facilities. The major cause of death on the reservation was accident, and this was attributed to the fact that proper medical care often was inaccessible.

Just over 20 percent of the roads on the reservation were paved. Only 8.4 percent of the homes had standard plumbing in 1970, and only 20 percent had running water. At the time of the study, 39 percent of the homes had electricity.

While the yearly per capita income increased from $82 in 1940 to $759 in 1973, it was still far below the national average. The 1970 census revealed that 64.4 percent of the Navajos were living at the poverty level, and 31 percent were unemployed.

Two school districts, one demonstration school, and one Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding school participated in the study. Slanted Rock School District was located in the northeastern part of Arizona. The major employers in the area were the Navajo tribe, the U.S. Public Health Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs Area Office, General Dynamics, and the school system. Approximately 20 percent of the students came from rural areas.

Gallup School District had an enrollment of 1757 students, 87 of whom were non-Native American. The main employers in this area were the Navajo Nation Health Foundation, a hospital, a two-year college, and a gas company. Many people commuted on weekends to a coal mine 150 miles away. Others worked at livestock raising and crafts.

Rocky Mesa Demonstration School, the first Indian-controlled school in the Navajo Nation, was located at the base of a mountain. There was no Rocky Mesa "community" per se:

> The school is in an isolated region of the reservation 17 miles from the nearest paved road and over 100 miles from the nearest town with a population of 2,000. (Roessel, 1977)

The people lived in small camps separated by several miles, and most had never been to school and spoke no English.

Because of changing economic pressures, people in the area had been leaving the pastoral economy of the past. However, the search for different types of jobs was a frustrating and embittering experience for those who were uneducated, unable to speak English, and unaccustomed to the ways of the white man's world (Roessel, 1977).

The Truchas community (pop. 1652) had been an area of Navajo residence for many centuries. A nearby mountain had been designated a medicine mountain and had been a point of rendevous since ancient times. Truchas spanned a highway between two other communities.

Traditionally, people in Truchas raised livestock and farmed. The area was rich in resources and water but remained economically undeveloped. There were four major businesses: a development corporation, a gas station, a general store, and a grocery.

With the exception of the bilingual education programs and conversations on playgrounds or within the dormitories, the schools were the only institutions of the Navajo Nation that demanded spoken English. In fact, the Navajo translation for "public school" is "where they go to school with Anglos." Commerce and business were conducted in Navajo. Public health and other officials used interpreters. Tribal council and chapter meetings used Navajo, and tribal courts permitted testimony in Navajo. A large number of radio stations on or near the reservation broadcast several hours a day in Navajo.

An orthography for the Navajo language was a fairly recent development, and as a consequence almost all written language on the reservation was in English. Signs in the trading posts and stores were all in English. The official newspaper, The Navajo Times, was written in English. Even written versions of prepared speeches in Navajo were in English; a tribal councilman recently had addressed a conference on bilingual education in fluent Navajo although the typed text in front of him was in English. Radio announcers speaking in Navajo used English scripts. Only with the recent revival of literacy associated with Navajo bilingual education had written Navajo showed signs of gaining ground.

Site 05: California. The four study schools of the San Francisco-Oakland site served student populations that were predominantly Chinese speaking. Three schools were in or near the San Francisco Chinatown, the fourth was in the Oakland Chinatown.

San Francisco Chinatown. The first Chinese to arrive in the San Francisco area were brought there by Americans in 1845. During the 1850s, the number of Chinese increased, as many came to work on such projects as the transcontinental railroad.

At first, the hardworking Chinese were regarded with favor, but as their growing numbers increased the supply of cheap labor, anti-Chinese sentiment developed, driving more and more Chinese to the enclave of San Francisco's Chinatown. The Chinese banded together, forming their own social organizations and churches. Anti-Chinese feelings grew to the point that on July 24, 1877, hundreds of men ran through the streets of San Francisco, attacking Chinese people.

Discriminatory legislation was common as well, and made life for the Chinese even more difficult. Most of these laws were subsequently ruled unconstitutional. Perhaps the most extreme was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which disallowed Chinese immigration and naturalization. Another San Francisco law prohibited Chinese from buying homes outside of Chinatown.

After World War II, the San Francisco Chinatown became a tourist center, drawing visitors from all over the world and catering to their wishes rather than to the needs of the local residents. Conditions did not improve. The population of Chinatown saw a decline in the 1950s as many Chinese moved away to the North Beach and Richmond districts, leaving the old people and tourists. Once the new immigration laws of the mid-1960s relaxed the restrictions on Asian entry, Chinatown began to grow again. The social makeup of the neighborhood failed to improve, however, since the more affluent Chinese continued to move away, leaving transients and tenements.

At the time data were collected, Chinatown had a population of 30,292 of which 22 percent was White, 71 percent was Chinese, and 3 percent was Hispanic. About 26 percent of the residents of Chinatown were unskilled workers employed in sewing factories and sweatshops. The skilled and educated usually did not settle in Chinatown or, if they did, they moved out quickly. The education level was relatively low, with 38 percent of the adults having less than a high school education. Furthermore, these figures did not reflect a recent influx of immigrants and refugees, many of whom had no education at all.

Chinatown was believed to represent the largest concentration of Chinese outside of Asia. Chinatown also was a highly overcrowded area characterized by unemployment, human exploitation, dismal housing, and crime. Chinatown had less than two acres of public open space and the highest density of any area in the city of San Francisco.

Furthermore, an increase in immigrants from Southeast Asia was creating an even worse economic situation in Chinatown. Ethnic Chinese from Vietnam, Laos, Hong Kong and China were streaming into the city, many settling in Chinatown at least temporarily. The result was that the problems of housing, unemployment, crime, and education were becoming even more serious.

Oakland Chinatown. The target school in Oakland was situated near downtown Oakland, which was populated mainly by low-income Blacks. This area was officially marked by the presence of bilingual street signs. In recent years, with the influx of Chinese from Hong Kong, Southeast Asia, and China, Chinese businesses and families had been expanding out from Chinatown toward the north and east. Still, most of the Chinese restaurants and shops were concentrated in a five or six square block area.

Despite the general decline of the southern end of downtown Oakland, Chinatown was enjoying a growth period. A new apartment and business complex had been erected a few years before. New businesses had cropped up throughout the area, and a giant business complex was planned. These developments were financed by Chinese both living in Oakland and overseas. Oakland Chinatown not only served the local community, but was a major activity center for Chinese and other Asian groups in the Bay Area.

In addition to English, the Chinese dialects of Cantonese and Tse Yup were often heard in this community. Generally speaking, people of the older generations spoke Tse Yup and Cantonese. Most younger adults spoke Cantonese. Young children in the community spoke English more than Chinese. Those younger persons who did speak Chinese were recent immigrants.

Chinese newspapers from San Francisco, New York and Hong Kong were sold in the community. Although the community itself did not have its own TV or radio station broadcasting in Cantonese or other Chinese dialects, Chinese TV programs from neighboring San Francisco could be received. In clinics and other community health service centers in and around the community, Chinese-speaking staffs were common.

The community was quite closely united for cultural activities and political events. There were four Protestant churches and one Buddhist temple within a six-block area of the community. There were a number of family associations whose members shared in common the same family names. There were also societies formed by people who had emigrated from the same areas in China.

The local community center was often the meeting place for youth and adult groups. The Chinese Community Center (CCC) likewise provided Chinese classes in the afternoon to Chinese school children. English classes were offered by the Neighborhood Centers of Oakland Unified School District to people of all ages from the local Chinese community at CCC.

A majority of the residents had immigrated within the last 10 years. They were mainly ethnic Chinese from China, Hong Kong, Burma, Vietnam, and other Asian countries. There were, of course, some residents of Chinatown who were second or even third generation Chinese Americans. The usual pattern, however, was for new immigrants to settle in the Chinatown area upon their arrival. Later, when they were established financially and more accustomed to American life, they moved to more affluent neighborhoods. The Chinatown residents were employed primarily in such industries as sewing factories, food-producing firms, and restaurants.

Site 08: Oregon. Ten classrooms were studied in four schools at the Salem, Oregon, site. Five of the classrooms were part of the school district's Southeast Asian bilingual program, the other five taught in the Spanish/English program.

As noted earlier, the immigrations of various ethnic minorities to Oregon have been directly related to development in the mining, ranching, agriculture, lumber and transportation industries. The 1980 census recorded a total state population of 2,689,496 with 8 percent of those residents belonging to ethnic minorities.

Salem was located in the agriculturally rich Willamette Valley and served as both the county seat and the state capital. The city's principal business was government. Its location near a major interstate highway had expedited the flow of resources and people throughout the valley. In addition, many families settled in Salem on a temporary basis to be near the prison facilities there or to engage in seasonal farm labor and food processing. The interstate also had encouraged the tourist and travel industries.

The total population of the city was 90,760, of which 3.5 percent was Hispanic and 2.5 percent was Asian. About 72 percent of the Hispanics were identified as Mexican while approximately 44 percent of the Asians were Vietnamese. Figures for the county for December 1981 showed the unemployment rate for Hispanics at 12 percent and for Indochinese at 19 percent. Members of both ethnic groups tended to find semiskilled and unskilled jobs related to agriculture, to cluster in low and middle income housing in northeast Salem, and to be disproportionately affected by the downturn in the area's economy. Several large firms, such as Boise Cascade, had recently closed their Salem operations. Even with seasonal adjustments for agricultural work, unemployment was projected at 20 percent for Hispanics and 60 percent for Indochinese.

The Indochinese appeared to face a more insecure future in Salem than the Hispanics because of the loss of federal refugee assistance and the unavailability of state support for living and housing. Oregon was one of the top three recipients of Indochinese refugees. In 1980, 98 percent of the Indochinese were receiving federal assistance; the state did not provide any financial support.

The Spanish-speaking residents of Salem made up more than 50 percent of the ethnic minority community. It was estimated that this figure would be closer to 65 percent if undocumented workers and their families were included. As a result of their longer residency in the Salem area, most Hispanics were eligible for federal and state welfare and unemployment benefits that were unavailable to the Indochinese.

The Hispanic community in Oregon was politically active. In 1980 the governor created the Commission on Hispanic Affairs to study the status of Hispanics in Oregon. There was, in addition, a state coalition of Hispanic organizations. Colegio Chavez, located near Salem, was the only four-year bilingual postsecondary education institution in the U.S. controlled by a Hispanic Board of Trustees.

Site 09: Hawaii. The 12 target classrooms on Oahu were located in four of the seven Hawaiian school districts. The communities from which these schools drew their students ranged from predominantly rural plantation areas to the urban outskirts of downtown Honolulu.

The Central Oahu School District stretched through the central corridor of Oahu. At the north end of the district were two rural agricultural communitites. Toward its center and south end were a mix of civilian and military communities.

The Honolulu School District was the smallest school district in Hawaii but had the most schools and the largest number of students. The area was primarily urban and suburban and included from low to high income households.

The Windward Oahu district extended along the east edge of the island, hemmed by the Koolau mountains on the west and the Pacific Ocean on the east. This district included urban, agricultural, and conservation areas. Although predominantly rural, the community was becoming more urban as the demand for housing inscreased. Since the closing of a local sugar mill in the early 1970's, the importance of tourism in this region had grown.

Leeward Oahu School District was in the southwest region of Oahu and was primarily suburban and agricultural. A major industrial park in this vicinity offered a variety of employment in steel and cement companies, oil refineries, and manufacturing firms. This district was also the location of a sugar mill and two military installations.

As noted earlier, Filipinos made up one of the largest ethnic groups in the state of Hawaii. The Ilokanos had been by far the largest Filipino group to migrate, driven in part by the barren, unproductive soil of northwest Luzon.

The first wave of Filipino immigration occurred in the early 1900s, spurred by the ceding of the Philippines by Spain to the U.S. and by the U.S.'s enactment of immigration restrictions against the Chinese and Japanese. As a result of the annexation, Filipinos could travel to the U.S. territories without restrictions. When the Hawaii Sugar Planter's Association in 1910 established a recruiting office in Manila, offering three-year contracts and fares to Honolulu, Filipinos began to arrive in large numbers in Hawaii--about 120,000 from 1907 through 1937.

A second, but briefer, phase of Filipino immigration occurred in 1946, again during a labor shortage. A third and continuing phase began in 1965 with the abolition of the immigration quota system that had favored European over Asian immigrants. From 1965 to 1981, 48 percent of all immigrants to Hawaii were Filipino. The proportion of Filipino immigration peaked at 71 percent in 1970 and was at about 61.7 percent at the time of the study.

Based on 1975 Office of Economic Opportunity data, a higher proportion of Filipinos were employed than other Oahu residents--59.2 percent of the Filipinos were in the work force while only 55.9 percent of all Oahu residents were employed. An examination of the types of occupations in which Filipinos were engaged showed that across ethnic groups Filipinos had the lowest proportion of males and females in professional, technical, and managerial positions. However, a higher proportion of Filipino females than Filipino males was employed in such positions (17.6 percent compared to 11.9 percent).

Hawaii's major industries were tourism, agriculture, and manufacturing. Its major crops were sugar, pineapple, domestic plants and flowers, and macadamia nuts. The principal manufacturing activities were the processing of sugar and pineapple. More immigrants than nonimmigrants were employed in the state's agricultural industries, including a large number of Filipinos. In recent years, however, the majority of Filipino immigrants (68.0 percent between 1965 and 1974) had been professionals.

There were 117 Filipino interest groups, professional organizations, regional social and business clubs. There also were cultural heritage clubs, civic, and religious groups. An umbrella organization, the United Filipino Community Council, drew together representatives of all of these groups.

One local radio station, KISA, carried 75 percent Filipino language programming. There were two weekly Filipino television programs. One, the hour-long "Filipino Fiesta" had been running for over 29 years and featured primarily entertainment. The other program followed an interview format with guests from the performing arts and various fields of government.

Bilingual Education Program Data

Five sets of information on the respective bilingual education programs were collected from the eight sites. These covered (a) rationale and philosophical base, (b) number of years in operation and reason for existence, (c) sources and percentage of funding, (d) language assessment procedures, (e) existing policies and goals, both state and district.

Once again, because of the variation in program characteristics across sites, the amount and type of data that could be collected at each site differed. The available program information for each site is described below. The data regarding rationale and philosophy were too voluminous to summarize. It should be pointed out, however, that with the exception of Community School District #4 in New York City, all the bilingual education programs in the study were officially "transitional" programs. For more information on those data, the reader is directed to the full report from Part I for each site.

Years in Operation and Reason for Existence

With the exceptions of the programs in Florida, Hawaii, and the BIA school in Arizona, the bilingual education programs observed were begun with Title VII funds. All but the BIA school at one time or another were recipients of Title VII funds.

Site 01: New York. Bilingual education had been in operation in District #4 for about 15 years. The early efforts began in 1967 with pilot testing of a Spanish language development program for elementary school Spanish-speaking children. The program was designed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory and entitled, "The San Antonio Language Development Program."

Site 02: Florida. The first bilingual education program in Dade County Schools was begun voluntarily in an elementary school in 1963. During the 1960s the Dade County approach to bilingual education was aimed primarily at linguistic and cultural integration of Cuban refugees into the essentially monolingual community. In the 1970s, with the introduction of a five-year plan for bilingual education, the district's goal shifted to development of functional proficiency in both languages.

Site 03: Texas. In the El Paso School District, efforts in bilingual education began in 1972, partially in response to U.S. Office of Civil Rights investigations and prior needs assessments.

Site 04: Arizona. Slanted Rock School District was cited in 1975 for non-compliance with the Lau Mandates. Though bilingual education had been discussed since 1973, it was not put into operation until a Title VII grant was received in 1975.

Bilingual education had been at the core of the Rocky Mesa Demonstration School since its inception in 1966 as an Indian-controlled school.

The Truchas boarding school was established in the 1930's by the U.S. government for the general education of Native Americans.

Site 05: California. In the Oakland Unified School District, the bilingual education program was begun in 1968 in response to community pressure and needs.

The San Francisco Unified School District began recognizably bilingual classes in 1968 as a result of community and professional pressure. In 1974, the district was taken to court by parents of Chinese-speaking children and eventually the district was ordered to provide bilingual education (Lau vs. Nichols).

Site 08: Oregon. The Salem district had used ESEA Title VII funds since 1975 to provide programs for its Hispanic LEP students and since 1979 for its Southeast Asian LEP students. The Spanish bilingual classes were self-contained and had been extended gradually to encompass students in grades 1 through 8. The LEP students who spoke a Southeast Asian language attended pullout-style ESL classes which were provided at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels.

In 1980 the district sought and received a Civil Rights Act-Title IV grant to develop a voluntary compliance plan. These efforts brought the district into full compliance with all state and federal requirements for educating minority language students.

Site 09: Hawaii. Bilingualism was an issue in Hawaiian schools as far back as the 1920s. At that time, education authorities recommended that more time be spent on English instruction. The TESOL bilingual education program was adopted in 1969. In 1979, the transitional bilingual model developed through Hawaii's Title VII Demonstration Project was put into use for the state-funded bilingual/bicultural education program. A variety of other programs also were available through the ESEA Title VII funds. They included: Honolulu District Learning Center, Project Ao Like (Learning to Do Together), Bilingual/Multilingual Teacher Training Project, and Pacific Area Languages Materials Project.

Funding

Funding for bilingual education across the sites varied considerably, both in terms of the sources and the percentage allocated from those sources. In general, there seemed to be very little consistency with regard to which available funds were directed toward bilingual education. In addition, it was not always possible to separate what Title VII funding paid for and what costs were absorbed by other federally funded programs or by state and local education funds. Information that was available is given below by site.

Site 01: New York. Of the 107 bilingual education teachers in District #4, all or part of the salaries of 92 were paid from tax levies, 22 from Module 5B (city funds set aside for LEPs), and 5 from Title VII (ESEA) federal funds.

Site 02: Florida. The allocation of funds to bilingual education for the 1981-82 school year in the Dade County school district is presented in Table 6. A breakdown of funding sources was unavailable but a number of programs used Title VII funds.

Site 03: Texas. The El Paso Independent School District received Title I, Title VII, ESAA, and state and local funds for use in bilingual education programs. The breakdown of these was not available at the time of data collection.

Table 6

Allocation of Funds for Bilingual Education

at Site 02 for 1981-82

Bilingual Education	
Teachers	$10,995,012
Aides	98,098
Materials, Supplies & Equipment	314,205
Employee Benefits	2,656,317
Total Bilingual Instruction	$14,063,632
Instruction and Curriculum Development	
Salaries	$ 219,344
Benefits	46,988
Total Curriculum Development	$ 266,332
Administration	
Total	$ 408,591
TOTAL BILINGUAL PROGRAM	$14,738,555

Site 04: Arizona. For Slanted Rock schools, the total budget for 1981-82, including special projects and capital outlays, was $11,680,827. There were numerous federal projects in the district such as: Title I, Community Education, Title IV-A, Title IV-B, Johnson O'Malley, Title IV-C Indian Education, Title VI-B, and Title VII. A full 30 percent of Slanted Rock's operational funds came from the federal government through Public Law 81-874, the Impact Aid Act.

At Gallup, total funding for the school district for the year was $5,152,052. The total of federal funds was $753,143. This was drawn from Title IV-A, Title I, Johnson O'Malley, Vocational Education and CETA (approximately $100,000). The percentage allocated specifically to bilingual education could not be determined.

At Rocky Mesa Demonstration School the total 1980-81 budget was $3,573,978.

Operational funds for the Truchas Boarding School came from the BIA, Title I and Title IV. Title I monies were used for aides and supplies to teach English. Title IV monies were used to purchase library books. The total school budget for 1981-82 was $1,437,287.

Site 05: California. For the 1981-82 school year, the Oakland school district budgeted $1,112,653 for its bilingual/bicultural education program. This funding was divided as follows:

General Instruction	$227,816
District Administration	336,146
ESEA Title I	80,718
Indochinese Child Assistance	35,341
Title VII Demonstration	37,842
Transition Program Refugee Children	136,536
EIA Limited English Speaking/ Non-English Speaking	203,348
Native American Program	54,906
	$1,112,653

Table 7 gives a breakdown of funding allocations in the San Francisco school district (SFUSD, 1980b).

Funding for bilingual education in the San Francisco district came from local, state, and federal sources, especially Title VII and ESAA Bilingual. For the 1980-1981 fiscal year, the total budget allocated to bilingual education by the San Francisco Unified School District was $15,085,524. The total district budget for that year was $192,400,000 (SFUSD Parent Newsletter, 1980a). Thus, San Francisco allocated approximately 8 percent of its budget to bilingual education.

Site 08: Oregon. For the 1981-82 school year, the Salem school district's operating budget for bilingual education programs was $765,839. This figure included $248,202 from district funds, $479,530 from federal sources, and $38,107 from state transition funds.

Table 7

Funding for Bilingual Education in the

San Francisco Unified School District for 1980-81

Source	Program		Amount
Federal	Bilingual Desegregation/Title IV		$ 909,432
	Title VII		1,189,300
	National Origin Desegregation/ Title IV		111,561
	Indochina Refugee Children Assistance		290,863
		TOTAL	2,501,156
State	EIA-LEP	TOTAL	3,460,000
District	ESL/Bilingual Support		1,179,746
	Elementary Schools		5,017,656
	Middle Schools		1,194,680
	High Schools		1,732,186
		TOTAL	9,124,368

The 1982-83 projected budget included $415,580 from the district, $479,597 from federal funds, and $56,949 from the state. A need for budget cuts, however, indicated that the number of instructional aides as well as monies for materials and activities would need to be reduced.

Title VII funds in 1981-82 provided $2800 for Parent Advisory Committee activities and 14 native language aides in Indochinese programs. District funds provided an added 3 ESL aides for the Indochinese program and 16 native language aides for the Spanish program. District funds for 1981-82 maintained salaries of 30 bilingual classroom teachers, 18 bilingual instructional aides, and classroom and student support services. The district, in addition, supported a bilingual education office with a coordinator, a program assistant for instruction, an office assistant, and a home/school liaison person.

Site 09: Hawaii. For the 1981-82 school year, the Hawaii state department of education reported an allocation of $3.3 million in state funds for special language services to more than 10,000 students in 223 schools. In addition, the state received about $1.6 million in Title VII ESEA funds for various bilingual education projects.

Language Assessment Procedures

Site 01: New York. The Language Assessment Battery, Levels I to III, was used at the New York site to assess English and Spanish language proficiency of all Hispanic and Spanish-surnamed students. The procedures were standardized. This measurement instrument was developed by the New York City Schools.

Site 02: Florida. In the Dade County Schools, all students of language origins other than English were screened through a brief oral interview in which they were asked their native language, the language they spoke most often, and the language spoken in their home.

Further estimations of English language proficiency were based upon one or more standardized tests, both locally produced and normed and nationally produced and normed. Local tests included the Dade County Test of Language Development Aural Comprehension and the Dade County Secondary Placement Test in English for Speakers of Other Languages. The school district used these national tests: the Oral Language Proficiency Scale, the Michigan Oral Language Production Test, and the Thumbnail Diagnostic Placement Test in English for Speakers of Other Languages.

Site 03: Texas. In El Paso, two nationally produced tests were used, the Oral Language Dominance Measure for placement in grades K through 3, and the Oral Language Proficiency Measure for grades 4 through 6. Procedures for both were standardized.

Site 04: Arizona. In the Slanted Rock school district, all incoming kindergarten students were assessed for language proficiency and dominance with a locally developed instrument. This instrument had proven to be highly reliable and correlated well with teacher assessments. Exit from the program was individualized and based on the student's progress in Navajo.

In the Gallup School District, parent interviews were used for initial language dominance assessment. These interviews were followed by teachers' observations of the child's language preference. Students in grades 6 to 12 were asked to do a self-assessment.

At the Rocky Mesa Demonstration School and the Truchas Boarding School, no formal language assessment was done in Navajo. Grouping for Navajo language instruction was done by the Navajo language teacher or the classroom teacher. There were no formal, systematically applied criteria for this evaluation. At Rocky Mesa, a teacher-developed, criterion-referenced instrument had been used in grades 1 through 5 to assess English language proficiency. Teacher assessments and standardized test scores also were used. High school students in Rocky Mesa were tested for English language proficiency using a locally developed instrument.

Site 05: California. Language assessment procedures in California were state mandated. The Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test was used to identify language proficiency.

In the San Francisco district, further language assessment procedures had evolved in response to federal and state mandates and to the unique needs of its rapidly changing, heterolingual student population. These procedures included the identification of students' primary language and whether they were limited in English proficiency. Instruments used by the district staff included: Basic Inventory of Natural Language; Bilingual Syntax Measure; and Language Assessment Battery. The language assessment activities made formal provisions for students' transitions from elementary to middle school and from middle school to high school.

The Oakland Unified School District had a policy for assessment and identification that included the use of the Home Language Survey and the Bilingual Syntax Measure as well as other teacher-made and norm-referenced tests. Entry level pretesting included the use of the Language Dominance Survey and the San Diego Quick Assessment, in addition to informal reading inventories.

Site 08: Oregon. During the 1980-81 school year, the Salem school district opened the "Newcomer Center," where primarily Indochinese students were assessed and interviewed to determine their native language and English proficiency as well as their level of education. Placements were made depending upon the individual child's age, parental preference, English proficiency, documented previous educational background, and mastery of "Survival English" and the Minimum Skills Objectives (MSOs), keyed to the district's curriculum.

Since students were moved from the newcomer program to other bilingual programs, they were not given standardized achievement tests in English. Instead, up to 15 English language objectives with 187 subskills were assessed with criterion-referenced tests, depending upon the individual child's progress. The English parts of the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), Levels I and II, were administered respectively to elementary and secondary students during the spring semester, once the student had been instructed for a period of time.

Site 09: Hawaii. All newly enrolled students in the Hawaii districts were identified through the Student Enrollment Form SIS-10. This form, completed by parents, initially indicated students who may have been of limited English proficiency. Potential LEP students were then administered the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) test of English proficiency. Students determined to be non-English proficient were then referred for testing of their native language proficiency. The results of both tests were used to determine students' language dominance level. Students were placed in programs based upon these tests as well as bilingual diagnostic tests or teacher-made instruments in the students' native language.

Policies and Goals

Site 01: New York. At the state level, the New York policy aimed to provide equal educational opportunity to language minority children by building on their native language proficiency and developing their English competency. The state viewed bilingual education as transitional. Students might participate for three years with extensions granted by the Education Commissioner for no more than six years.

The bilingual education policy as stated by the district was to preserve the student's self-esteem through (a) developing and maintaining L1, (b) facilitating the acquisition and development of L1 and L2, (c) strengthening cognitive, affective, and psychomotor abilities in all areas of the curriculum in both languages, and (d) increasing awareness and respect for both languages through communication.

Site 02: Florida. According to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education, the state of Florida had no specific law regarding bilingual education and therefore no formal policy. In general, the district expected LEP students who had participated in the bilingual program for two years to be functionally proficient in a mainstream English class.

At the district level, the goals for students who were not of English language origin were (a) to provide a means of maintaining academic standing in the regular English curriculum while learning English, (b) to develop skills in the native language, and (c) to develop insights into the students' home cultures. The goals for students who were of English language origin were (a) to develop the students' skills in the second language, and (b) to develop insights into the culture or cultures represented by that language. The program was limited to Spanish and English, but other languages could have been added.

Site 03: Texas. The state of Texas viewed bilingual education as a compensatory program that could meet the needs of language minority children and "facilitate their integration into the regular school curriculum." Financial support was provided only for grades K through 3, although some allowance was made for individual students in grades 4 and 5.

The El Paso Independent School District stated only that it provided a bilingual education program in accordance with state law and in compliance with state guidelines.

Site 04: Arizona. Arizona, while requiring that public education be conducted in English, did allow for bilingual education in the Education Law of 1980 (S15-202 B). It states:

> In the first eight grades any common school district where there are pupils who have difficulty in writing, speaking, or understanding the English language because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively,

> the district may provide special programs of bilingual instruction. (Education Laws K-12)

The Slanted Rock district had declared its support for a bilingual and multicultural education program, but no clear operational definition of these concepts had been developed.

In the Gallup school district the Board of Trustees had issued this statement:

> We believe that innovation and change in education--both content and methods--are necessary for meeting the needs of our youth as they face life in a multicultural world. We also believe that education is best achieved when students become involved in experiences meaningful to their lives in today's world.

The Rocky Mesa school board's philosophy stressed the necessity for students to be able to cope with modern technology as well as to retain and revitalize the traditional values of the Navajo community.

The BIA, in schools such as Truchas, maintained a language immersion approach towards teaching English to Navajo children. The bureau had funded several English language development curriculum projects over the years. The Navajo Area Language Program was one of these.

Site 05: California. The Chacon Bill, passed by the California State Assembly, required school districts to provide certain types of bilingual instruction to language minority students to assess their language proficiency. For grades K-6, if a school had 10 or more limited-English-proficient students at the same grade level it had to provide those students with one of a variety of bilingual education programs.

The rationale and philosophical base for bilingual education in the San Francisco Unified School District could best be described as mixed. Its policy was prefaced by a recognition of the multilingual and multicultural nature of American society and described the central aim of the bilingual program as the acquisition of English with "concurrent retention and development of native language and culture. Nor should the acquisition of English language and American culture be allowed to separate the child from his family and community." Policies and models abounded, but in actual practice it was clear that two languages were indeed used in the bilingual classrooms.

The stated goals of the Oakland Unified School District were: to provide bilingual and bicultural education for all grades from K through 12; to provide bilingual instruction in the subject areas in both languages in a relevant bilingual setting; to provide cultural enrichment courses; to increase the cultural awareness and language proficiency of target children; to develop the bilingual skills of all staff including the English-dominant; and to encourage parent involvement and utilize community resources.

Site 08: Oregon. In order to provide equal access to educational goals for students with limited English proficiency, the Salem school district had worked with a broad cross section of the educational community to develop a plan that blended legal and educational considerations with Salem's needs and resources. The plan included these goals: to assure proper placement of LEP students in district programs through appropriate identification, assessment, diagnostic-prescriptive approaches and monitoring procedures; to assure equal access to learning for LEP students; to adequately staff district programs with properly trained personnel to best meet the needs of LEP students; and to provide opportunities for the involvement of parents of LEP students in all aspects of district activities.

Site 09: Hawaii. In October 1981, the Hawaii State Department of Education developed a state education plan charting educational directions for the 1980s. Among the policy statements in the plan were the following:

> A major purpose of education is to provide students with basic skills necessary to function in a complex society.
>
> Education should also enhance the personal development of individuals, including physical development, aesthetic appeciation, recreational pursuits, and promoting languages.
>
> Education should assist individuals, especially the disadvantaged, to meet job qualifications.
>
> Education should promote an understanding of Hawaii's cultural heritage.

Summary

The Part II macro-level data presented in this chapter illustrated the great diversity of the SBIF descriptive study sites in geography, ethnicity, language, and demography as well as in the philosophy and implementation of their bilingual education programs.

A summary of the communities in which the study was conducted may highlight some similarities, such as the predominance of urban settings and of Hispanic ethnolinguistic groups, but must necessarily concentrate on the differences among the sites. The geographic representation in Part II, for example, was very broad, comprising sites in the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Northwest, Southwest, West, and Pacific Basin. Although the majority of the sites examined schools in large metropolitan areas (New York, Miami, Chicago, El Paso, San Francisco, Oakland, and Honolulu), significant contrasts were provided by the Salem site and by the rural Navajo and Oahu communities.

The greatest proportion of students and teachers who participated in the study were Hispanic, but large numbers of Chinese, Vietnamese, Navajo, and Filipinos also were included. Furthermore, the larger Hispanic group consisted of Cubans, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans. The languages spoken by the participants in the study included: Spanish, Cantonese, Navajo, Vietnamese, Ilokano/Tagalog and English. Members of nearly all the ethnolinguistic groups studied shared the fact that their native language was prevalent in their home communities; store and street signs, newspapers, television and radio shows, and church services in the residents' native language were common. The Navajo situation was different in that an orthography for the Navajo language was a fairly recent development. Consequently, almost all written language on the reservation was in English. In Salem, the the Vietnamese refugees received little local exposure to their native language, perhaps because their immigration was relatively recent and diffuse.

The demographic information relating to the study participants again revealed some similarities and many differences across the sites. At all but the Navajo site, the ethnolinguistic group studied was composed of recent immigrants to the U.S. The reported conditions of the Mexican residents in the Salem area were somewhat of an exception since their immigration was not as recent as that of the other ethnolinguistic groups studied. Overall, the most newly arrived members of the immigrant groups tended to be in the lowest socioeconomic stratum of their community. The groups studied reflected high proportions of unemployment; those who were employed usually worked at unskilled or semiskilled jobs. Generally, the longer a group had resided in an area, the better off its members were economically. The Cuban group in Florida was a good example of this phenomenon; in that area the Hispanics seemed to be growing in political and economic power. The Navajo group, on the other hand, was an exception; on the Reservation, nearly 65 percent of the Navajo lived at or below the poverty level and 31 percent were unemployed.

With regard to the specific schools and districts studied, student populations ranged from 272 at the Truchas Boarding School in Arizona to 224,580 in Dade County School District in Florida. The proportion of students at each site from the target minority group varied from 5.6 percent in the Salem district to 100 percent at two of the Navajo schools. Exact reports of the numbers of bilingual teachers at each site were unavailable, but it was clear that limited English proficient students at each site had access to teachers and aides who were bilingual in English and the students' native language, or who spoke English but were teamed with others who were proficient in the students' native language. The one exception to this standard was in Salem; 50 percent of the instructional staff was proficient in Spanish, but there were no certified instructors proficient in Vietnamese. This district, however, did use instructional aides who were fluent in Vietnamese.

The approaches of the participating school districts toward their bilingual education programs provided further comparisons and contrasts. The majority of the programs were started in the late 1960s and early 1970s as a result of community pressures and federal and state requirements. Most were started with Title VII federal funding and all but the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding school had at some point received Title VII funds. The BIA school was different, too, in that it had been started in the 1930s. The Dade County program was begun somewhat earlier than the other programs (in 1963) and was started voluntarily. This program and Hawaii's TESOL program were adopted without the aid of Title VII. In some instances it was clear that legal requirements were largely responsible for the existence of bilingual programs. In San Francisco, for example, the school district was compelled to provide bilingual education when it lost a lawsuit (Lau vs. Nichols) brought by parents. The Slanted Rock district later was cited for non-compliance with the Lau vs. Nichols court mandate.

Funding for bilingual education programs varied greatly across the sites, both in the proportions spent for bilingual programs and in its sources. Although the diversity of the data available from the sites made precise comparisons impossible, some observations could be made. All of the programs received some form of federal funding, and all except the Truchas BIA school appeared to rely on some combination of federal, state, and local monies. (Operational funds for the Truchas school came from the BIA, Title I, and Title IV.) The proportions of funding received from these different sources were wide ranging. In San Francisco, for instance, about 16 percent of the bilingual program was federally funded, 23 percent was state funded, and 60 percent was locally funded, while in Salem the comparable figures were 63 percent, 5 percent, and 32 percent. In Hawaii the state paid for 67 percent of the districts' bilingual programs while the federal government paid for 37 percent.

Procedures across sites for language assessment were similar in that most districts used standardized, nationally normed language assessment tests. Only schools at the Arizona site did not. Data from New York, Florida, California, Oregon, and Hawaii indicated that those sites further used locally developed language assessment instruments. At the Arizona site, assessment procedures varied from school to school: Slanted Rock used a locally developed instrument; at Gallup, assessment was based on parent interviews and teacher observations; at Rocky Mesa students were grouped according to teacher developed criterion-referenced instruments and test scores; the BIA school had no formal language assessment procedures. The Oregon school district, in evaluating the Vietnamese refugees, used a "newcomer center" where students were placed by age, parent request, language proficiency and previous education.

The consensus of policies and goals regarding bilingual education indicated that most states allowed for such programs in order to provide equal educational opportunity for limited English proficient students. Only California required that bilingual education be available. Florida had no formal bilingual education policy. The districts' policies provided primarily for transitional bilingual programs, however, they did tend to recognize additional goals such as maintaining a cultural heritage or preserving the students' self-esteem. The formal policy of the Dade County school district encouraged English-speaking students as well as LEP students to learn a second language. At perhaps the opposite end of the spectrum was the BIA school, which promoted an immersion approach to English language acquisition. The New York district's program was unusual in the it aimed at maintenance and development of the LEP students' first language in addition to the acquisition of English.

CHAPTER THREE

DESCRIPTION OF PART II STUDENTS

The data presented in this chapter describe various characteristics of the student sample that composed Part II of the SBIF study. Included in these descriptions are: the number of classes and students at each site; the number of classes and students in in each of the four substudies; and information on the sex, language proficiency, and instructional participation styles of the students.

During Part II of the SBIF descriptive study, data were collected for 1,959 students. The data for these students were used to select a smaller group of 356 target students who participated in the four substudies. Detailed information on the target students and analyses of the substudies are contained in the specific SBIF substudy reports. (See SBIF-83-R.12, SBIF-83-R.13, SBIF-83-R.13.1, SBIF-83-R.15/16, and SBIF-83-R.9/10.)

As mentioned in Chapter One, the SBIF study sites were purposively selected to obtain a diverse sample of limited English proficient students in bilingual instructional settings. The student characteristics sought were: a variety of languages, varied levels of language proficiency, different grade levels, varied proportions of LEP students in bilingual classrooms, and different styles of participation in classroom instruction.

This chapter will present (a) a description of the sample selection process, (b) an overall description of the study sample, (c) language characteristics of the student sample, (d) the enrollments of language minority students in the sample classrooms, and (e) a breakdown of the instructional participation styles exhibited by the students.

Sample Selection

A goal of Part II of the study was to have four target students in each classroom, resulting in a minimum of 40 target students for each of the eight sites. The target students were to be chosen to represent several levels of English language proficiency, a balance of boys and girls, and a full scale of classroom participation styles. In order to select the target students, basic data in these three areas were obtained for all the students from the participating teachers.

The teachers were asked to rate the oral English language proficiency of their students on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 representing the lowest proficiency and 4 the highest. If the students had a first language other than English, their proficiency in that language was also rated. Within each class, students were selected so that two target students were at an English proficiency level of 1 or 2 and two students were at Level 3. If there were not enough students at the third level, students at Level 4 were selected.

Prior research (Good & Power, 1976; Mehan, 1979; Philips, 1972; Bossert, 1979; Ward, Rounds, Packer, Mergendoller & Tikunoff, 1981) has shown that certain participation characteristics can be clustered to reflect a student's typical pattern of communication, self-expectation, and social relationships in the classroom. Such information provides a means for investigating the ways in which students participate in various instructional activities.

With regard to the students' participation styles, the teachers were asked to complete for each student a form listing 21 participation characteristics. These characteristics were grouped by the researchers into six participation style categories. The student sample was selected so that no two target students in the same class exhibited the same participation styles.

If during target student selection there was conflict among the three selection factors of language proficiency, sex, and participation style, the factors were hierarchically arranged. English language proficiency was considered most important, followed by sex, followed by instructional participation style. Thus, if there were only boys in a particular class with English proficiency at Level 1 or 2, then more boys than girls were chosen from that class. Similarly, if the available range of participation types would have prohibited an equal sample of boys and girls, then the balance of the sexes was maintained.

For one of the substudies (II-B), which examined the stability of bilingual instructional features and consequences for students, an added selection factor for the Part II target students was whether they had participated in Part I.

Description of the Sample

Table 8 describes by site the sample of schools and classes participating in Part II of the SBIF study. The table also shows the breakdown of classes and students included in each of the four substudies (I-A, I-B, II-A, and II-B).

The table shows that a total of 89 classes in 39 schools participated in the study. Three to eight schools were involved at each site. Of the 89 classes, 74 were part of a bilingual program, 15 were not; 49 classes were nominated by constituents as successful bilingual instructional settings, 40 were not.

Table 8

SBIF Part II Sample Description

Site	No.of Schls.	No. of Classes	Type of Program		Nominated		Grade Level																	Substudies							
																								IA		IB		IIA		IIB	
			BL	Not BL	Yes	No	K	1	1-2	1-4	1-5	2	2-3	2-6	3	3-4	3-5	4	4-5	5	5-6	6	6-7	C	TS	C	TS	C	TS	C	TS
01	4	12	12	0	3	9	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	6	24	2	8	12	24
02	3	12	11	1	12	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	10	40	2	8	6	10
03	4	10	8	2	4	6	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	28	3	12	5	9
04	5	12	7	5	3	9	0	4	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	28	2	8	11	28
05	4	12	10	2	6	6	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	2	8	5	13
07	7	10	10	0	10	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
08	4	10	5	5	0	10	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
09	8	11	11	0	11	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	39	89	74	15	49	40	6	9	7	1	1	11	2	1	10	5	1	4	3	4	5	8	1	21	84	36	144	11	44	39	85

BL = Bilingual
C = Classes
TS = Target Students

The grade levels of the participating classes ranged from kindergarten through seventh. The sample at most sites included six grade levels. One site looked at five grades, one at seven, and another at eight. Note that each site represented a variety of elementary grade levels. In order to emphasize instructional features, lower elementary grades were purposely over-represented in the sample.

The data from the table regarding the substudies show total samples of 358 target students and 107 classes. These totals reflect the fact that some students and classes were included in more than one substudy.

Substudy I-A, which examined the generalizability of the identified features and consequences of bilingual instruction from Part I of the study in new ethnolinguistic groups in new settings, studied 21 classes and 84 target students. Substudy I-B looked at generalizability at one new site and in different classes at continuing Part I sites; this substudy involved 36 classes and 144 target students. Substudy II-A concentrated on teachers from Part I who continued into Part II in order to examine the stability of the identified features; this substudy consisted of 11 classes and 44 target students. Substudy II-B looked at 39 classes and 85 students. The emphasis in this substudy was to examine the stability of bilingual instructional features and consequences for students by observing Part I students in their new Part II classrooms.

Language Characteristics of Students

The data collected regarding the students' language characteristics included information on: their home language; their oral English proficiency rating; their first language; and their oral non-English proficiency rating. This information is reflected in Table 9. Table 9 also presents the breakdown of male and female students by site.

The four levels of language proficiency, by which the teachers were asked to classify their students, were defined as:

- o Level 1 indicated that the student neither spoke nor understood the language;
- o Level 2 indicated that the student had some fundamental understanding of the language;
- o Level 3 indicated that the student understood and spoke enough of the language to participate in elementary conversations; and
- o Level 4 indicated that the student had a reasonable command of the language (Fuentes & Weisenbaker, 1979).

Complete data were unavailable for all students in Table 9. This was primarily because some teachers provided only partial information for their English proficient students, omitting non-English language

Table 9

Language Characteristics of SBIF Part II Student Sample

Site	No. of Classes	No. of Students	Sex		Language Background		English Oral Proficiency Rating				Student's First Language								Oral Non-English Language Proficiency			
			M	F	LMS	EP	1	2	3	4	English	Spanish	Navajo	Chinese	Ilokano/ Tagalog	Viet-namese	Other Indo-Chinese	Other	1	2	3	4
01	12	305	162 (53)	143 (47)	286 (94)	19 (6)	27 (9)	60 (20)	95 (32)	116 (39)	19 (6)	286 (94)							15 (5)	46 (16)	110 (39)	114 (40)
02	12	351	168 (48)	183 (52)	318 (91)	33 (9)	100 (29)	85 (25)	78 (22)	83 (24)	33 (9)	317 (90)						1 (0)	1 (0)	9 (3)	11 (4)	275 (93)
03	10	99	57 (58)	42 (42)	99 (100)	0 (0)	5 (5)	29 (30)	23 (23)	41 (42)		99 (100)							2 (2)	10 (10)	5 (5)	82 (83)
04	12	224	116 (52)	108 (48)	223 (99)	1 (0)	3 (1)	48 (22)	66 (30)	106 (48)	1 (0)		223 (99)						37 (17)	42 (19)	39 (18)	104 (47)
05	12	275	135 (49)	140 (51)	270 (98)	5 (2)	20 (7)	64 (24)	96 (35)	91 (34)	16 (6)	5 (2)		232 (84)	1 (0)	13 (5)	4 (1)	4 (1)	1 (0)	6 (3)	35 (19)	146 (78)
07	10	228	108 (47)	120 (53)	210 (92)	18 (8)	75 (34)	53 (24)	62 (28)	28 (13)	18 (8)	209 (92)					1 (0)		2 (1)	9 (5)	32 (18)	134 (76)
08	10	238	101 (42)	137 (58)	127 (53)	111 (47)	15 (6)	38 (16)	35 (15)	150 (63)	111 (47)	58 (24)		3 (1)		30 (13)	36 (15)		9 (7)	16 (13)	26 (20)	76 (60)
09	11	239	133 (56)	106 (44)	234 (98)	5 (2)	19 (8)	125 (52)	89 (37)	5 (2)	3 (1)				220 (92)			16 (7)	16 (7)	104 (45)	80 (34)	33 (14)
Total	89	1959	980 (50)	979 (50)	1767 (90)	192 (10)	264 (14)	502 (26)	544 (28)	620 (32)	201 (10)	974 (50)	223 (11)	235 (12)	221 (11)	43 (2)	41 (2)	21 (1)	83 (5)	242 (15)	338 (21)	964 (59)

Note. Cell entries for sex, language background, language proficiencies and first language indicate numbers of students. The entries in parentheses show percentages of students based on available data. Notice in particular that for Site 03 only target student data are included.

LMS = Language Minority Student
EP = English Proficient

proficiency ratings for English proficient students. The percentages contained in the table were based on available data, rather than data for the total number of students.

Table 9 shows first that the total number of male and female students was almost equally divided, although the balance by site varied.

The home language of the students is reflected in the "Language Background" column of Table 9, in which students are listed as either a Language Minority Student (LMS) or an English Proficient (EP). A LMS designation indicated that a student's first language was one other than English; it did not necessarily mean that the student was limited English proficient, but did show which students were members of minority cultures. An EP designation was given to native speakers of English. Out of the total of 1,959 students, 1,767 (or 90 percent) were considered LMS by their teachers; 192 (or 10 percent) were considered EP.

In the category of oral English proficiency, data were obtained for 1,930 students. Of these, the largest proportion of the students (620, or 32 percent) was at the highest proficiency level of 4. The number of students classified at Levels 2 and 3 was roughly the same; 502 students (26 percent) were placed at 2, while 544 (28 percent) were placed at 3. The smallest group of students (264, or 14 percent) had the lowest proficiency level of 1.

Data on the students' first languages were obtained for 1,959 students. About 10 percent of these students had learned English as their first language. The largest group of students (50 percent) had learned Spanish. About 11 percent had learned Navajo; 12 percent had learned Chinese; 11 percent had learned Ilokano/Tagalog; 2 percent had learned Vietnamese; 2 percent had learned another Indochinese language; and 1 percent had learned other languages.

For the characteristic of non-English oral language proficiency, data were collected for 1,627 students. The largest proportion of students was again placed in the most proficient level of 4; this group consisted of 964 students or 59 percent of the total group. The number of students at Level 3 was 338 (or 21 percent) and at Level 2, 242 (or 15 percent). The smallest group (83 students or 5 percent) was placed in the lowest proficiency category of Level 1.

The data shown in Table 9 demonstrate that the sites selected for the SBIF study offered a student sample in which (a) a large number of students were native speakers of a non-English language; and (b) the students displayed a wide range of English proficiency levels. The LMS information indicated that in most of the classrooms, even students who were not limited English proficient were usually members of the minority cultural group. The oral language proficiency data showed, too, that there were students who were considered by their teachers to be proficient in both English and another language.

Enrollment of Language Minority Students

In addition to obtaining a sample of students with varying degrees of language proficiency, the SBIF study sought to examine bilingual instruction at different grade levels and at sites with different proportions of limited English proficient students.

Table 10 shows the grade level, the total enrollments, and the percentage of language minority students for each classroom in the study. Two aspects of the bilingual programs studied should be mentioned in conjunction with this table. First, the low enrollments and high percentages of LMS given for some grades resulted from pullout-style bilingual programs in which language minority students were separated from English proficient students for bilingual instruction. Second, at Site 05 two classes were taught alternately by bilingual and monolingual English teachers, so the student total here appears inconsistent with other student totals for this site.

At each of the eight sites there were 10 to 12 classrooms. Noting that the pullout-style classes used at Sites 03 and 09 reduced the full enrollment figures, the enrollment ranged from 8 to 65 students. Table 10 illustrates that 71 classes (or 80 percent) had 16 or more students; 52 classes (or 58 percent) had 21 or more students.

The proportion of language minority students in the classes varied from 30 percent to 100 percent. The average proportion of language minority students across sites, however, was about 90 percent. Eighty-four classes (or 94 percent) had more than 50 percent language minority students.

Instructional Participation of Students

The last category of data collection for the total student group concerned the students' styles of participation during instruction. In order to obtain a cross section of participation types, the SBIF researchers asked the classroom teachers to complete a form for each student that listed 21 participation characteristics. From these forms, researchers were able to determine the participation type for 1,515 of the 1,959 students in the study. Some teachers completed participation characteristic forms only for language minority students, so no participation data were available for many of the English proficient students.

The participation style categories employed for the SBIF study can briefly be described as:

- Type I: These students tended to be engaged concurrently in several work activities and to perform well on all of them; they answered questions when called upon, giving

Table 10

Enrollment of Language Minority Students in Part II Classes

Site 01			Site 02			Site 03			Site 04			Site 05			Site 07			Site 08			Site 09		
Grade	Class Size[a]	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS	Grade	Class Size	% LMS
1	36	100	K	23	96	K	8	100	1	16	100	K	29	93	K	29	52	1	22	73	1	23	100
1	35	91	1	24	88	1	12	100	1	27	100	K	30	93	K	25	100	1-2	20	55	1-2	39	100
1-2	21	95	1	24	100	1	9	100	1	23	100	1	32	100	1	15	100	2	22	77	1-4	46	100
1-2	20	95	1	23	65	2	9	100	1	21	100	1	29[b]	90	1	25	100	2-3	19	58	1-5	13	77
2-3	17	100	1	23	61	2	10	100	1-2	14	100	1	29	83	2	24	100	3	23	30	2	21	100
3	20	95	1-2	23	100	3	11	100	2	17	94	2	27	88	2	21	100	3-4	25	36	2-6	20	100
3	20	95	1-2	65	95	3	10	100	2	15	100	3	20	100	3-4	17	100	4-5	24	38	5	15	100
3-4	21	95	3	22	100	3	14	100	2	20	100	3	30	93	3-4	30	100	5-6	33	42	5-6	17	100
3-4	27	85	4	35	89	5	8	100	2	15	93	4	31[b]	94	3-5	26	100	5-6	22	55	6	11	100
5-6	20	100	4	34	100	6	8	100	3	16	100	4-5	31	94	6-7	16	75	5-6	28	46	6	10	100
6	32	100	5	23	100				4	20	100	4-5	16	100							6	24	100
6	36	81	6	32	81				6	20	100	5	31	94									
Total	305			351			99			224			335			228			238			239	
Average % LMS		94			90			100			99			94			93			51			98

[a] Low enrollments and high percentages of LMS in some grades resulted from pullout-style bilingual programs in which language minority students were separated from English proficient students.

[b] This class operated on an alternate-day basis so that the same group of students was taught by two teachers.

correct and complete responses; they seldom interrupted their work to interact with other students unless the interruptions were initiated by others; they seldom needed a teacher's help but would ask for it if necessary.

- Type II: Type II students alternated concentration on assigned tasks with high involvement in predominantly social conversations with other students; they participated actively, though not always correctly, in lessons; they initiated interactions with peers or teachers for either academic or social purposes.
- Type III: These students needed frequent assistance or feedback from teachers or else they failed to maintain engagement in tasks; they attended to instruction better when in small groups or when involved in manipulative tasks.
- Type IV: Type IV students almost always attended to tasks but with little active verbal or physical involvement; they rarely initiated interactions with teachers or other students.
- Type V: Type V students exhibited only sporadic involvement in assigned work. Instead, they played quietly or gazed about the classroom. They tended to be separated either physically or socially from others and were reluctant to let others see their work.
- Type VI: These students displayed disruptive, confrontational behavior that led to frequent sanctions by teachers; they seldom attended to tasks.
- Type VII: Students placed in this category could not be clearly identified with one participation type.

A breakdown of the number of students by participation type and by site is presented in Table 11. The percentages contained in the table reflected a percentage of the students for whom data were obtained, rather than a percentage of the total students.

Table 11 shows that Type II was the most prevalent instructional participation style; this type was demonstrated by 334 students or 22 percent of those for whom data were obtained. Type II was followed closely in frequency by Type I, which was exhibited by 312 students or 21 percent. The next most frequently described behaviors were Type V (274 students or 18 percent) and Type IV (247 or 16 percent). Type III behavior was exhibited by 135 students, or 9 percent. The participation type reported the least often was Type VI; 91 students or 6 percent were described as being in this category. Another 122 students (8 percent) could not be classified.

Table 11

Instructional Participation Types for Students in Part II Classes

Site	Participation Type						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
01	19 (15)	26 (20)	17 (13)	30 (23)	14 (11)	18 (14)	5 (4)
02	28 (14)	29 (14)	31 (15)	33 (16)	35 (17)	18 (9)	31 (15)
03	28 (28)	23 (23)	7 (7)	13 (13)	12 (12)	4 (4)	12 (12)
04	43 (19)	48 (22)	20 (9)	39 (18)	42 (19)	7 (3)	23 (10)
05	90 (33)	44 (16)	17 (6)	29 (11)	69 (25)	14 (5)	12 (4)
07	56 (31)	34 (19)	19 (11)	30 (17)	19 (11)	8 (4)	13 (7)
08	16 (9)	39 (23)	9 (5)	43 (25)	47 (28)	9 (5)	6 (4)
09	32 (14)	91 (38)	15 (6)	30 (13)	36 (15)	13 (5)	20 (8)
Total	312 (21)	334 (22)	135 (9)	247 (16)	274 (18)	91 (6)	122 (8)

Note. Entries indicate numbers of students for whom participation types were obtained. The numbers in parentheses represent percentages of students based on the available data.

Summary

The focus of the SBIF descriptive study was on limited English proficient students in different bilingual instructional settings who displayed a variety of language characteristics. Descriptive data were collected for 1,959 students in 89 classes at 39 schools.

The data collected for the overall student group were then used to select a smaller sample of 356 target students. The target student selection was geared to obtain students who were rated in the lower levels of English proficiency, who provided a balance of boys and girls from each class, and who displayed a wide range of instructional participation styles.

The description of the overall student sample presented in this chapter illustrated that these students spoke many languages, but primarily Spanish, Cantonese, Navajo, Ilokano/Tagalog, Vietnamese and English; only 10 percent of these students were described by their teachers as learning English as their first language. About 59 percent of these students were rated by their teachers as reasonably proficient in a non-English language, while 32 percent were rated as proficient in English.

The student enrollment in the classes varied widely (from 8 to 65 students), primarily because of pullout-style bilingual programs in which limited English proficient students were separated from English proficient students for bilingual or ESL classes. At least 58 percent of the classes had 21 or more students. The average proportion of language minority students for all sites was about 90 percent.

The data obtained regarding students' instructional participation types indicated that the largest proportion of the students (22 percent) were Type II (predominantly social students who initiated interactions). Another 21 percent exhibited Type I behavior (engaging successfully in multiple tasks). The smallest proportion of students (6 percent) fell into the Type IV category of disruptive behavior.

Overall, the student group from which the target student sample was drawn displayed significant diversity in languages spoken, English and non-English language proficiencies, and proportions of language minority to English proficient students. The classes to which these students were assigned further provided a variety of grade levels and enrollments.

CHAPTER FOUR

DESCRIPTION OF PART II TEACHERS

The purpose of this chapter is to present (a) descriptive information on the sample of teachers who participated in Part II of the SBIF study, and (b) a synthesis of the teachers' perceptions and understandings regarding bilingual education. The data contained in this report were obtained in two ways: through individual open-ended curriculum interviews conducted with the collaborating teachers at each site and through a teacher language survey.

The methodology of the open-ended interview process combined both topical and sequential approaches. That is, the project directors and site staff guided the interviews to the essential topics to be covered. The specific questions, however, were adapted to each interview. This method assured that the topics discussed across interviews would remain consistent even though the exact wording of the questions was altered to fit the flow of the individual interview.

The individual project directors submitted the curriculum interview data from their site to a constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which included: (a) reading through all interview protocols and coding the information applicable to the topics of interest; (b) compiling a list of responses to each topic by teacher; and (c) comparing and contrasting information across respondents.

The teacher language survey was conducted in conjunction with a study by InterAmerica Associates, Inc., funded under the Part C Research Agenda for Bilingual Education, the "1980-81 Survey of Teachers' Language Skills." Teachers participating in the SBIF descriptive study completed questionnaires that were developed by InterAmerica.

The personal data about the teachers that are presented in this chapter were obtained from both the individual teacher curriculum interviews and the teacher language survey. In these, teachers were asked to provide information about their backgrounds in various areas relating to their bilingual instruction.

Four basic areas of information relating to the teacher sample will be presented here: descriptive data about the teachers, such as native language, language use during instruction, training and experience; their views of the criteria for student entry to or exit from a bilingual program; their philosophies regarding bilingual education; and their assessments of the effectiveness of their own bilingual programs. The data will be presented by site and then summarized.

Characteristics of the Teachers

For Part II of the study, the overall sample consisted of teachers nominated as successful bilingual teachers as well as other unnominated bilingual and monolingual teachers. Further descriptive data about the teacher samples for the four substudies are contained in the SBIF Part II substudy reports (SBIF-83-R.12, SBIF-83-R.13, SBIF-83-R.13.1, SBIF-83-R.15/16, & SBIF-83-R.9/10).

The data on the teachers reported here, primarily through tables and figures, describe: the teachers' first language; years of teaching experience; years of bilingual teaching experience; the extent of monolingual and bilingual professional training; the languages used in instruction; and the teachers' estimates of the time spent on non-English languages and on ESL.

Teachers' First Language

As part of the teacher curriculum interview, Part II teachers were asked to indicate their first language. Table 12 shows the numbers of teachers by site and by their native language.

Table 12

Native Languages of Part II Teacher Sample

Language	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
English	3	1	4	4	5	3	5		25 (28%)
Spanish	9	11	5			7	5		37 (42%)
Navajo				7					7 (8%)
Chinese					7				7 (8%)
Ilokano/ Tagalog								11	11 (12%)
Other			1	1					2 (2%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Of the 89 teachers interviewed, 25 were native English speakers and 64 were native speakers of a language other than English. The largest proportion (about 42 percent) of the participating teachers were native Spanish speakers. It should be noted that the overall sample reported here includes teachers from all four Part II substudies, and thus includes teachers who did not teach in bilingual programs, but taught ESL or regular classes.

The "Ilokano/Tagalog" group included teachers who were native speakers of either of these Filipino languages, even though the specific student group studied spoke Ilokano. The category described as "Other" represented teachers who grew up speaking neither English nor one of the languages included in this study.

Years of Teaching Experience

The teachers were asked to report their years of general teaching experience as well as the number of years they had taught in bilingual classes. Table 13 reflects the number of teachers by site according to their years of overall teaching experience. Table 14 presents information on that part of the teachers' years of experience spent in bilingual instruction. In general, the participating teachers were fairly experienced. The largest proportion (about 29 percent) had taught from 6 to 10 years. The bulk of the teachers (55 percent) had 1 to 5 years of bilingual teaching experience. Another 29 teachers (or 32 percent), however, had 6 to 10 years of bilingual teaching experience.

Table 13

Years of Teaching Experience of Part II Sample

Years	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
0									(0%)
1 to 5	8	2	2	4		3	3	1	23 (26%)
6 to 10	2	2	5	6	3	3	5		26 (29%)
11 to 15	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	17 (19%)
16 to 20		3	2		4	1		3	13 (15%)
21 to 30		3			2	1		4	10 (11%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Table 14 lists six teachers from monolingual English classrooms who had no bilingual teaching experience. These were teachers who participated in Part II of the study.

Table 14

Years of Bilingual Teaching Experience of Part II Sample

Years	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
0			2	1	2			1	6 (7%)
1 to 5	8	6	3	5	5	5	8	9	49 (55%)
6 to 10	4	3	5	5	4	5	2	1	29 (32%)
11 to 15		2		1	1				4 (4%)
16 to 20		1							1 (1%)
21 to 30									(0%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Professional Training

The Part II teachers were asked to describe their professional training, for education in general and specifically for bilingual education. Table 15 shows the highest degree completed by each of the participating teachers. While many of the teachers were working toward further degrees or had completed course work beyond that required for their degree, only completed degrees were tabulated. All of the teachers had obtained a standard credential.

Table 16 presents information on teachers' bilingual professional training and bilingual credentials. The "Degree/Graduate Degree" category refers to degrees in bilingual education. The "Course Work" and "Inservice Workshops" categories refer specifically to work in bilingual education. Some teachers had several types of bilingual professional training, others had none. A total of 84 percent, however, had some type of bilingual training. At the New York (01) and Illinois (07) sites, 100 percent of the teachers had bilingual professional training. The lowest proportion of teachers with bilingual training was at the Oregon (08) site, where 50 percent of the teachers had bilingual professional training.

Table 15

Extent of Professional Training of Part II Teachers

Training	Site 01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	Total
BA/BS	5	7	8	10	9	6	9	11	65 (73%)
MA/MS	7	2	2	2	3	4	1		21 (24%)
Ph.D.		3							3 (3%)
Standard Credential	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89 (100%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Table 16

Extent of Bilingual Professional Training of Part II Teachers

Training	Site 01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	Total
None		1	3	2	1		5	2	14 (16%)
Degree/ Graduate Degree	8			1		2			11 (12%)
Course Work	3		1	7	1	7	1	6	26 (29%)
Inservice Workshops	1		7	3	7	1	3	5	27 (30%)
ESL Inservice		11			3		2		16 (18%)
Bilingual Credential	10	10	7	3	7	9	2	6	54 (61%)
Number of Teachers with Training	12	11	7	10	11	10	5	9	

Note. Some teachers had more than one type of training.

Language Use During Instruction

The use of various languages during instruction in the study classrooms is recorded in Table 17. The category of "English Only" depicted teachers who taught in only English; 20 of the 89 teachers fell into this group. The remaining language categories represented the number of teachers who used both English and the students' first language. The 69 teachers in those categories used English, in varying degrees, together with Spanish, Navajo, Chinese or Ilokano.

In addition to reporting the language they used in instruction, the participating teachers were asked to estimate the percentage of class time they spent using a non-English language in instruction, as well as the time spent in actual ESL instruction. The data received from the teachers is presented in Tables 18 and 19. Notice that for the overall sample, nearly 50 percent of the teachers reported using a language other than English more than a quarter of the time. Of the subsample of teachers who used L1 in instruction, this represented more than 75 percent.

Table 17

Languages Used in Instruction by Part II Teacher Sample

Language	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
English Only		1	5	5	4		5		20 (22%)
Spanish	12	11	5			10	5		43 (48%)
Navajo				7					7 (8%)
Chinese					8				8 (9%)
Ilokano								11	11 (12%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Table 18

Class Time Spent in Non-English Instruction Reported by Teachers

Time	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
0%	4	1	1	6	4		4		20 (22%)
1% to 10%	1		2	1	1				5 (6%)
11% to 25%	2	2	1		3		2		10 (11%)
26% to 50%	2	5	2	2	3	7	3	7	31 (35%)
Over 50%	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	3	15 (17%)
No Answer	1	2	3	1				1	8 (9%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

Table 19 presents the teachers' estimates of the percentage of class time spent teaching English as a Second Language. More than 40 percent of the teachers reported teaching ESL more than a quarter of the time. Of the teachers who taught ESL, two thirds devoted more than 25 percent of class time to that area.

Table 19

Class Time Spent on ESL Reported by Teachers

Time	Site								Total
	01	02	03	04	05	07	08	09	
0%	6								6 (7%)
1% to 10%	2		1						3 (3%)
11% to 25%	2		2		4	4	5	1	18 (20%)
26% to 50%	2	1	2	2	1	5		4	17 (19%)
Over 50%		6	1	3	4		5	5	24 (27%)
No Answer		5	4	7	3	1		1	21 (24%)
Total	12	12	10	12	12	10	10	11	89

View of Entry/Exit Criteria

In addition to providing information regarding their language use and professional training, the teachers were asked to describe their views and perceptions of various aspects of bilingual education. The statements of the teachers were synthesized and are presented here with regard to three specific topics: (a) bilingual program entry/ exit criteria, (b) philosophy of bilingual education, and (c) bilingual program effectiveness. This information is presented under each topic by site and then each topic is summarized.

Site 01: New York

Bilingual education at the participating New York school district was treated as an enrichment experience and the parents of all students were provided the option of bilingual instruction for their children. Although students in the program were primarily Hispanic, a small number of Black students had been placed in the bilingual program at their parents' request. Therefore, the bilingual program had multiple goals including: (a) that Spanish-dominant Hispanic students master English while concurrently maintaining and developing their Spanish language skills; (b) that English-dominant Hispanic students improve their English language skills while developing their Spanish language proficiency; and (c) that English-monolingual students attain some Spanish language proficiency while developing English language skills commensurate with their grade levels.

In view of the multiplicity of goals, the criteria for student entry to and exit from the bilingual program at Site 01 took on a character unique to the site, distinguishing this site from others in which bilingual education was conceived only as remedial or transitional.

The majority of the teachers interviewed knew of the district's policy of retaining students in the bilingual program regardless of the strength of their English language skills. As expressed by one teacher:

> Our school offers parents the opportunity of giving their children a bilingual elementary education. The students are not mainstreamed into English monolingual classrooms unless parents request the transfer.

Another teacher described the district policy this way:

> Students should only be exited if the school philosophy is one of transition. This is a bilingual school and we offer bilingual education to all students.

Two teachers in the sample, however, supported transitional bilingual instruction. One said that after two years of bilingual instruction the students should have "the basic language skills to function properly in an all English environment." The other teacher stated that pupils should be exited "when they are able to use the English language, and understand it, and also have good reading habits." To this teacher, achievement test scores in English were the primary criterion in transferring students to all English instruction.

One teacher added that students who had a negative attitude toward Spanish should be exited from the program, since such an attitude impeded learning and made the classroom experience difficult for both students and teacher. According to two teachers, a negative attitude toward Spanish was a major problem with many students in the higher grades.

There was a consensus among the teachers that student admission into the bilingual program in this district was based on parental request and that priority was given to students who spoke little or no English.

Teacher responses to questions concerning students' functional language proficiency indicated that most teachers felt it took three to four years of bilingual instruction before students could function comfortably in all-English instruction. One teacher stated that she knew a student to be functionally proficient "when he or she is more relaxed and outgoing and begins to associate with students of different language skills.

Site 02: Florida

The Dade County teachers' predominant criterion for entry to the bilingual program was the district test that categorized students' English language comprehension. Half the teachers interviewed stated that exit from the program should be based on English language proficiency. Other criteria mentioned were: teacher observations; teacher judgment and tests; English proficiency together with academic achievement; and language proficiency in both English and the minority language.

One Anglo teacher in the bilingual program who used only English for instruction said that she thought students should be exited from the bilingual program after two or three years regardless of their proficiency. Her feeling was that if students were allowed to remain in the bilingual program indefinitely that they would become complacent about learning English. She described the district policy this way: "The main goal is for them to learn the English, but yet still not penalize them for not knowing the English."

Teachers who had a native language of Spanish and who taught in either Spanish or both Spanish and English had a different perspective. Two of these teachers recommended that students stay in bilingual classes through grade 6, while another thought they should be taught bilingually from kindergarten through grade 12. Despite her obviously strong support for bilingualism, this last teacher emphasized that developing "independent English proficiency" was her primary goal.

All of the students in this teacher's class had language proficiency problems. She said:

> Right now, they do not--cannot--establish a conversation in English all by themselves and they, of course, are somehow hesitant to do so because they feel they are not secure in the language and they want to participate in their peers' games and activities and understand television and all those things. They are lacking that ability. And so that is our main objective, to sort of gain fluency in English.

Only one of the teachers interviewed seemed to know the official district policy regarding exit from the bilingual program. She stated that the district's goal was for students who had been in the bilingual program for two years to be able to function in a regular classroom without the aid of ESL classes.

The teachers at this site defined "functional proficiency" in these ways: "able to speak, read, and write English"; "able to function in society"; "able to understand English"; "asks/answers questions"; and the point at which the teacher could "use normal speed when questioning students."

Site 03: Texas

When teachers at the El Paso, Texas, site discussed exit from the bilingual education program they were actually talking about a process whereby students were transferred from a reading/language arts in Spanish and ESL program to a reading/language arts in English program. At this time the students' instruction switched from Spanish/English to English. The El Paso school district policy stated that this transfer was to occur when the student scored a 5 in English on the Oral Language Dominance Measure (OLDM) and achieved certain reading/language arts criteria in Spanish. Most students were transferred by the end of the second or beginning of the third grade. These students, however, were still considered to be in the bilingual education program as they continued to receive "transfer of skills" instruction as well as instruction in Spanish for Spanish-Speakers (SSS).

Few of the teachers at this site had formed opinions different from the district policy regarding entry and exit criteria. One teacher did suggest that the timelines for testing should be more flexible so that the student could be tested earlier in the school year, when the teacher felt that the student was ready for the test.

Half of the teachers commented that they felt their own opinions as to whether individual students were ready for transfer should be considered by the district in addition to the OLDM or other measurements. They thought that a student was often kept in the Reading in Spanish program when his or her teacher thought the student would have done well in the Reading in English program.

When teachers were asked to elaborate on what they meant by "proficiency in English," these were among their replies:

> Being able to comprehend what someone tells him or her and respond to it orally or physically. Later being able to read and write the English language in the correct form using correct grammar.
>
> (Students) must be able to read in an on-level basal, to be able to leave the neighborhood and function in the real world, read the newspaper, get across town, get on an airplane.
>
> (The student must) understand what he has heard in English; use the basic English structures in a variety of communicative situations . . . speak, read, and write fluently in English, to understand and appreciate the English culture, customs, and traditions.

Three teachers mentioned achievement in academic skills in addition to English language proficiency as a basis for transfer out of the program. One of these teachers also emphasized proficiency in Spanish as a basis for transfer.

The impression of the project director at this site was that all of the teachers wanted to rush the students through the Spanish reading, emphasizing the ESL instruction and teaching them enough English to get by, so that the students could be moved as soon as possible to English-only instruction. It seemed that most of the teachers felt the earlier students transferred, the better off they would be with respect to English acquisition. While not all of the teachers expressed this feeling strongly, six of them clearly made the point that ESL was not emphasized enough while perhaps too much time was spent on Spanish with Spanish-dominant students. Some of their comments on this topic follow.

> (Students) need to start reading in English early. By the third grade it's time to sink or swim.
>
> If you give them too much Spanish instruction they disregard the English instruction and they listen only to the Spanish instruction.
>
> I know that some of my kids know English, and yet they speak to you in Spanish because of course it's a lot easier and they're not being forced to speak English.

Site 04: Arizona

The Navajo teacher sample consisted of seven Navajo-bilingual teachers and five monolingual-English teachers. The official district policy toward exit criteria at this site provided for bilingual education for transitional purposes up until the third grade. At the third grade students would be exited to a monolingual classroom, many of which maintained a bilingual aide.

An underlying exit criterion of both Anglo and Navajo teachers who participated in the study was for students to master the basics prior to entering a monolingual classroom. Most agreed that students' ability to use both Navajo and English basic skills occurred around the third grade.

One Anglo teacher felt that exit criteria should vary according to the needs of the child. She commented:

> I know the one boy that we put into English was ready for it. He wanted to read. He had some of the decoding skills. I have one student that could stay in Navajo, I know next year for sure all year.

A second grade Navajo teacher expressed this view of exit criteria:

> If a Navajo child can speak really good English but doesn't know how to read English, he won't be ready. He has to master those skills, phonetic skills and basic skills in reading. I would then consider the student really a good English-speaking child.

The teachers' criterion of mastering the basic skills was qualified by their statements that exiting should further depend on the language ability of the child. One teacher said she thought it could be detrimental to a child to place him in a monolingual classroom too soon.

Functional proficiency was seen in two ways at the Navajo site, with both views shared by Navajo and Anglo teachers. Some teachers felt that functional proficiency was the minimal ability to communicate and get along, while others felt that it was important to function well in the classroom at grade-level tasks.

A sixth grade Anglo teacher described functional proficiency this way:

> I think to be functional, to be basically functional, would just mean to be able to carry on a conversation, when we meet someone, simple conversation. . . . The question is making them respond, so . . . a definition of functional is could you go out to New York and live? And, I think they could.

A first grade Navajo teacher said that to be functionally proficient a child "would be able to handle the English language like they do the Navajo language." A second grade teacher thought it was important that the child "be comfortable at the tasks set before him, no matter what it was, at the grade level he's being taught."

Site 05: California

The teachers at the California Site 05 generally were unaware of explicit entry/exit criteria for the Chinese bilingual programs in their schools. The only exceptions were two teachers at a public school specifically formed to aid Asians new to the Bay Area. These teachers said that their programs were designed for immigrant and refugee students. Students were enrolled for one year at this school before being transferred to regular schools.

The teachers' impressions were that students were entered into the bilingual programs if they were newly arrived in the U.S., if they were non-English speaking, or if their parents requested it.

One teacher said that exit from her bilingual program was based on scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills plus an oral interview. The teachers personally felt that students were ready to exit if they could handle their assignments and were comfortable using English.

One teacher added:

> Language is one factor that is basic. (You) should also consider if that child is emotionally ready. Because when they get into another calssroom situation they'll just sit back and they'll vegetate and they won't open their mouth for anything. And they're not really learning that much because they're not speaking. . . . They haven't really developed enough confidence in themselves using the language.

Site 07: Illinois

The teacher sample at the Chicago site consisted of 10 bilingual Spanish-speaking teachers. The bilingual program extended through the sixth grade. Entry to the program was based on parental request and the language needs of the student. The students' English language proficiency was assessed through the Iowa Test and CRTS. The teachers were eager to have their minority language students meet the standards and guidelines for the English-speaking students.

Many of the classrooms at this site had a mix of English-speaking students and Spanish-speaking students. The teachers felt that such language integration was an asset and that the Anglo and Hispanic students were developing postive attitudes towards each other.

The Illinois teachers said that they encouraged students to stay in the bilingual program. They thought, however, that the students were ready for monolingual classrooms when the students were able to work in and understand English at 80 percent of the grade-level requirements.

Site 08: Oregon

Curriculum interviews were conducted with 10 classroom teachers in the bilingual program in Salem, Oregon. Five of these teachers were monolingual English-speaking instructors in the Southeast Asian bilingual program, the other five were native Spanish-speaking teachers in the Spanish/English program.

All of the participating teachers appeared to reject English proficiency as the sole determinant of students' entry to and exit from bilingual programs. Although they described the importance of being able to communicate orally, to understand English, and to function at the appropriate grade level with native English-speakers, the teachers suggested several other aspects of the students' development that they thought should be considered as well.

Among these other considerations were the enrichment obtained from one's native culture, a student's social and physical development, a minority student's feeling of self-worth, and the parents' attitude toward bilingual education. One teacher stated:

> I think that oftentimes the students who are in the bilingual program are proficient in English, but they want the cultural aspects of the bilingual program. So, just because they are proficient in the language does not mean they cannot continue obtaining the cultural enrichment of that language.

Another teacher felt that

> The parents may want the child to stay in the multilingual classroom for as long as possible. I also make sure the parents play a role in determining exit into mainstream classrooms through conferencing with them. I also look to see how the student is relating with the other kids on the playground as well as how positive is the student's self-image.

A teacher who viewed the development of language proficiency as a lengthy learning process--requiring a minimum of four years for elementary students--discussed the way in which she felt native language proficiency contributed to the development of English proficiency.

> First I think they have to become competent and proficient in their first language. . . . I think that once the student can communicate well in the second language and can also read well in the first language, I think that is the prime time to switch them over. If they are reading well and communicating in the first language, then it is very easy to switch over to the second language because their reading skills are primarily the same.

A majority of the teachers at Site 08 indicated that the children should remain in the bilingual program until the completion of sixth grade.

Site 09: Hawaii

The criteria for entering or exiting bilingual programs as described by the teachers of the Hawaii site were complex, based on an array of standardized language and basic skills achievement tests as well as teacher judgment. Most of the teachers cited the official state guideline as the principal exit criterion, that is, a score at or above the 25th percentile on reading, math and language arts achievement tests.

In practice, however, the process seemed to vary. One teacher, for example, described two students who were proficient in English but who scored low on the mathematics and reading subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test. After she instructed them individually for several weeks, she determined,

> They are OK in the classroom, and they are functioning well, so what I do is gather more data on them and then just mainstream them.

Similarly, another teacher said she mainstreamed students "whenever I feel that they can do the work in our curriculum." She determined the students' development levels by using the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) as well as her own judgments and observations.

A number of other tests of basic skills and of language development were employed by these teachers. Among these were the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINAL), the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), the English Proficiency Test (EPT), and tests of language dominance.

The teachers stated that their schools' administration of achievement tests was inadequate in terms of the frequency given and the grade levels tested. Teachers found it necessary at times to ask either their principal or the district office for permission to give such tests. One teacher described that procedure as a problem:

> It is a tedious and time-consuming process . . . (but) we have to administer the test because it is a good gauge of the child's progress.

Despite the use of standardized tests, much individual discretion seemed to be used in the placement of students. For instance, one student who was adequate in English but who was achieving at a low level was retained in a special education class. Some students would be mainstreamed after only one year in the bilingual program, others after three or four years.

Philosophy of Bilingual Education

Site 01: New York

In discussing their philosophies of bilingual education, the Site 01 teachers described three ways in which they felt such education benefited students. A prevalent view was that bilingual instruction gave students of all language backgrounds an opportunity to become bilingual, thus improving their chances for success in society. A second perspective suggested that bilingual education strengthened the minority language students' self-concept by having them experience pride in their language and culture. The third argument saw bilingual instruction as providing equal education that would improve the minority students' opportunities in an English-speaking culture. In the words of one teacher:

> The goal of the bilingual program is to equip the students with the skills necessary to get them back into the system so that they can move on up.

The teachers generally agreed that in language-related subjects such as reading and language arts, instruction should take place exclusively in the designated language. For example, one teacher said:

> If you're teaching in Spanish, instruction should be all in that language. If you're instructing in English, it should be all in that language. . . . There shouldn't be that back and forth.

The teachers felt, however, that language alternation was both useful and necessary for explaining and clarifying concepts. One teacher described her approach to teaching math this way:

> The lesson can be presented in English first with a short summary in Spanish at the end. . . . When I feel that children don't understand what I have said to them in English I try to explain it in English in another way. But if they still don't understand, then I'll present the vocabulary in Spanish and also summarize the steps of the lesson in Spanish.

A few teachers suggested that limited English speaking students should be taught with the use of a buddy system (peer teaching), so that students could serve as language models for each other.

Site 02: Florida

The responses of the Dade County teachers regarding their philosophy of education stressed the importance of teaching students English as well as basic academic skills. Other priorities were for students to achieve the course objectives established by the district and to become bilingual. Individual teachers stated that it was important for students to feel that learning could be fun, to learn social etiquette, and to be able to understand what was said to or around them.

The general attitude among the teachers was that being bilingual was as asset in Dade County and that the multiple languages and cultures enriched the community. One teacher described her philosophy of bilingual education this way:

> Bilingual education offers our community the possibility to benefit from many different cultures, makes our society richer culturally while providing the opportunity for others to learn languages.

The teachers seemed to agree that the use of the students' native language helped them to progress academically. One teacher commented:

> Bilingual education is effective because the students are receiving instruction in their own language. . . . So when the English-speaking teacher teaches them the same concepts they feel happy and at ease because they already understand the task.

The teachers varied somewhat in their opinions of how the two languages should be used in the classrooms. Some monolingual teachers said they preferred to have a Spanish-speaking teacher come to their rooms to teach certain subjects in Spanish so that the students would be better able to understand when the same content was taught later in English. Other monolingual teachers preferred two separate curricula with one ESOL program to reinforce lessons taught in the regular class.

Bilingual teachers for the most part believed that Spanish should be used whenever clarification or understanding of concepts was required. They felt that Spanish should be used more frequently during math, science, and social studies since those subjects could be difficult even when taught in a student's native language.

The Site 02 teachers varied in their preferred methods for teaching LEP students. Among the methods described as most effective were: repetition, translation, the "flip-flop" system (in which Spanish-speaking and English-speaking teachers alternated teaching the same content), audiovisual materials, and ESL techniques. One bilingual teacher who used both English and Spanish for instruction thought that "using the same materials as those used by regular students but with easier homework assignments" was the best way to teach LEP students. Two teachers preferred to use different materials than those assigned by the district; four others supplemented the assigned materials with their own.

Site 03: Texas

The participating teachers in the El Paso schools generally felt that bilingual education was the best and only means of educating Spanish-dominant students while maintaining the students' positive self-concept. They further perceived that the main purpose of bilingual education was to enable LEP students to move into regular classrooms as soon as possible.

Some of the teachers expressed a desire for bilingual education for all children, not just language minority students. They saw this as an ideal, however, and stressed that it was difficult enough to obtain bilingual education for their Spanish-dominant students.

All of the teachers at this site were opposed to code-switching during reading and language arts lessons. The only exception to this was when a student needed clarification of a word or concept. The teachers generally agreed that both languages should be used in the content areas of math, science and social studies as needed for student understanding and clarification. For students who had not yet transferred or who had very recently transferred to English instruction, the teachers would introduce a concept in Spanish and then proceed with the lesson in English, translating spontaneously into Spanish if necessary. They all felt that content should not be sacrificed for English.

The teachers in addition expected the students to give responses in English. In order to encourage the students, the teachers would sometimes offer an example of a particular word or statement in English or ask the students to translate what had just been said into English. This strategy was used not only in the language areas but but during other subjects as well.

One exception to this policy of language use in the classroom was expressed by a teacher who felt that when working on a group project students should feel free to use the language they preferred. She explained:

> We have a mixture of students. . . . In order for them to produce something in English they have to communicate with each other in Spanish.

In their discussions of their own attitudes toward bilingual education, the teachers noted the reluctance of many students to use English. These students were under pressure from friends who would accuse them of becoming too Anglicized.

Site 04: Arizona

All of the teachers interviewed at the Navajo site felt that bilingual education was important primarily for two reasons: (a) Navajo was needed to explain concepts the students didn't understand while they were still learning English; and (b) bilingual education implied understanding of the students' native culture and customs.

The teachers felt that use of Navajo accelerated the students' learning process and that understanding of the students' culture promoted their positive self-image.

These teachers disagreed about whether students should be taught Navajo or English first. One teacher questioned whether teaching the students to read in Navajo first enabled them to ever "catch up" in English reading. Other teachers felt that once children learned to read in Navajo they could easily transfer their skills into English. A Navajo teacher, when asked if the children would be better off reading in English first, said:

> I don't think so. They're better off reading in Navajo because their first language was Navajo. . . . I think they're progressing about the same. At the beginning of the year I thought the English-dominant were ahead. Now they are equal.

Several teachers thought it was important to sometimes expose the students to teachers who spoke only English, feeling that forcing the students to use only English made them try harder. All of the teachers said they stressed English throughout the daily curriculum; Navajo in most cases was used to facilitate learning.

All of the teachers stressed the cultural importance of using Navajo for instruction. They described changes in the students' participation when English was used. A Navajo teacher commented:

> In Navajo there's no problem but in English they kind of draw back when they know they can't talk to that other person. But if you ask them in Navajo things like "What did you do today?" they'll just go down the line and list them all for you and say, "This is what I did."

Another Navajo teacher described Navajo participation in the following way:

> At the beginning of the year or when they don't speak out, I know they were raised like that. . . . My mother taught me not to. I don't know. It's just the way she taught me, because when somebody talks to me, I don't really answer right away.

Site 05: California

The teachers of the Oakland and San Francisco schools of Site 05 seemed to feel that bilingual education was helpful in developing and maintaining students' self-image and respect for their native culture. These were among their statements:

> Bilingual education is to help the child develop in both languages and to appreciate their native language

> and to build on those skills so that they can make the transition to English more easily . . . and also just to give them a feeling of appreciation for (their native language), so that hopefully they will maintain their native language and not get this feeling that it's something you don't use, or something you laugh at when you hear people say it.
>
> My major goal, overall, is to develop a really strong, good self-image. . . . (A child) is supposed to come in here, he's supposed to gain. He's supposed to gain the Chinese language. He's supposed to gain a positive self-image. To be really smart in English is easy. But if you're smart in English and Chinese, then you're extra special. . . . I wish I could get them to love Chinese just as much as English.

Some teachers at this site felt that a bilingual program was especially important for recent immigrants and refugees. One teacher said:

> Being able to get along, I think that's another thing with limited-English-speakers. They're coming into a new culture and there are certain things that students need to learn. Because some students come from other places and they've never been to school before and they just have to learn the idea of what school is.

Another teacher contributed:

> I think I'd like them to learn that . . . for these people that come from overseas, although it's considered a new culture and new country for them, that there's nothing frightening about it and whatever they bring with them, it's important, too.

With regard to the use of languages in the classroom, the teachers at the California schools agreed that the students' native language was very useful at times to explain and clarify. However, they encouraged the students to use English.

One bilingual teacher described that process this way:

> I use English all day long. I only use Chinese when they don't understand. . . . I do everything before. I dramatize. I do all kinds of things before. I don't want them to wait for the Chinese. I don't want them to say, "Well, if I don't get the English, she'll tell me in Chinese pretty soon." I try to pull it out of them as much as I can. I'll be using Chinese to teach the Chinese.

Site 07: Illinois

The teachers at the Chicago site used various techniques of bilingual instruction. A few followed the method of using exclusively one language at a time. One kindergarten teacher maintained that this was the proper approach:

> Now, the flip-flop going to languages and translating it for the children is no good. In order to learn a language you have to hear it and let it go through your mind and maybe at the beginning you have to memorize it. . . . If you translate, the child is learning that you are going to give him the answer and then he is not going to learn as fast.

In contrast, a second grade teacher explained everything first in English and then translated into Spanish. Still another teacher used Spanish only to clarify a word or concept; she stressed learning English and being mainstreamed as soon as possible.

All of the Illinois teachers mentioned the importance of bilingual education for cultural reasons. They felt that bilingual teachers better understood the character and needs of their minority language students. One teacher said,

> We are teaching in two languages and they can relate to me more confidently because first of all I understand their language. I understand their culture. I know why they are here.

Site 08: Oregon

The teachers working in the bilingual program in the Salem schools all expressed belief that a classroom environment and instructional approach needed to reflect a warm, trusting, and multicultural feeling to promote the LEP students' confidence and academic achievement. All agreed that students' mastery of their native language was basic to their acquisition of the English language, and that the use of both languages in the classroom was beneficial both academically and socially. Significant benefits were described by these three teachers:

> For the language minority students the most important thing will be liking for the school. Before we had bilingual education, the dropout rate was tremendous. I would like the language minority students to continue their education.

> I expect different things from LEPs because they are not English proficient. I expect them to gain some English proficiency. In other academic areas, such as math, I expect them to be

> on grade level with native language help if necessary. . . . Language experience is a method that really works because the children use the language that is known to them.
>
> I think the bilingual classroom allows native speakers to be with students from their own culture, rather than feeling isolated among cultural strangers. English language development complements this culturally familiar environment and is stressed more so than in a regular classroom.

Although the consensus of the teachers was that the bilingual classes were necessary, some of the teachers frankly described the problems they faced. One said:

> The worst thing for a student in my classroom would be not to cooperate with the group. With eight languages, ages spanning 8-12, three emotionally disturbed, two grade levels, an aide and teacher unable to speak all languages, cooperation was essential in my classroom this year.

Another summarized her philosophy, and some of the dilemmas of bilingual education, this way:

> I have some trouble with a bilingual education program that is isolated from the normal classroom situation. Yet, I think it critical that limited-English-speaking kids are in classrooms where teachers care about them and understand them. I strongly believe in mixed classrooms so that the Southeast Asian students can learn English survival skills as quickly as possible. However, there is an equal need that these kids maintain their cultural pride and self-identity and worth. We must continue the Vietnamese, Hmong, Khmer, and Laotian reading. . . . This is critical to their cognitive learning. I am alarmed by isolated bilingual programs which tend to shelter and hide their students from the realities of surviving in an English-speaking environment. They must learn English language skills in order to survive.

Site 09: Hawaii

As with many of the teachers who participated in the study, the support for bilingual instruction expressed by teachers at the Hawaii site was based on personal experiences. One teacher said she realized others thought bilingual education was "a waste of time," but:

> I've seen a child just sitting down in a corner without doing anything because she cannot communicate with the teacher. Only when the bilingual teacher comes in, only then did the child have learning.

Another teacher envisioned a more general need for such instruction:

> We need it because there are more immigrants coming to America now. . . . We should have what I would call mainstreaming after adjusting and molding the child to society. . . . You cannot just put a fish into an aquarium right from the store. You have to have the thing adjust to his environment first, and then we mainstream them into the bigger society.

Although these teachers expressed strong beliefs in the importance of developing the children's English skills, they also supported the maintenance of their native language. The degree to which they emphasized maintenance ranged from those who felt the native language and culture should be stressed and preserved to those who thought the native language should be used in the classroom only until the students could function in monolingual English settings.

Teachers who supported an emphasis on maintaining or developing minority students' own language and cultural awareness explained that they felt this approach would promote the minority students' positive self-image and ultimately provide them a better chance of becoming a contributing member of a monolingual English class.

At least one of these teachers indicated that she thought bilingual classes were better for recently immigrated students than ESL classes. She said:

> With children who are locally born, (ESL) works very well but not so much with the newly arrived student. . . . Associating the immigrant students with their classmates in their regular classrooms would help them in many ways, would help them in their way of talking and in their way of learning the language itself.

Perception of Program Effectiveness

Site 01: New York

Most of the participating Site 01 teachers were fairly satisfied with the effectiveness of their bilingual program. Generally, the teachers who were more critical of the program instructed in the Learning Experience Approach Program (LEAP). Students in LEAP were in danger of being held back for a year and therefore in need of much support.

One teacher criticized her own bilingual instruction by saying:

> I'm not fully pleased. . . . The students' needs are so great and diverse that I can't get to all of them.

Another teacher was unsure about the effectiveness of the instruction. She said:

> It's hard to say. You're working toward these goals which are very hard to define. . . . All I can say is that I'm giving it my all.

A majority of the teachers felt that instructing in Spanish was very difficult. They attributed this difficulty to: (a) a scarcity of materials that resulted in more planning time; (b) a promotion policy that disregarded student achievement in Spanish; and (c) negative attitudes toward Spanish on the part of students.

The following excerpt expressed one teacher's concern:

> I feel like I have been cheated to a certain degree in Spanish. . . . If I had the same quality of materials as I do in English, I could plan a variety of activities that made instruction more exciting for the students.

Another teacher said:

> Bilingual teachers, especially those in the LEAP classes, are expected to do so much in English in order to get students promoted that we can hardly get to do Spanish. It's a shame.

Three additional problems were identified as interfering with instruction at one school: (a) excessive student absence; (b) high mobility; and (c) the organizational arrangement for English and Spanish reading instruction. As in other schools in the district, this school "streamed" for reading. That is, students were departmentalized and assigned to teachers on the basis of test scores. This process created more homogeneous groups.

Site 02: Florida

Only three of the Dade County teachers described any problems in their bilingual instruction; most said they would make no changes in the existing program. This attitude was displayed by one of the bilingual teachers who stated:

> We used to have an all Spanish block and all English block. Now we are having more English than Spanish. It is working pretty good, because they do have Spanish at home, most of them.

Two teachers said not enough time was spent with students. One teacher said the main difficulty was lack of English language development displayed by students with a Hispanic home language.

One monolingual English teacher said she would prefer to have a Spanish teacher in the room with her, another said she would like to keep her students all day and have a Spanish teacher come in for specific lessons. One teacher thought bilingual programs should be available "for years on end" and that they were particularly helpful to Latin students. Other teachers suggested spending more time on reading in the first grade or on language arts in general.

Site 03: Texas

El Paso teachers generally were very supportive of the district's bilingual program; the bilingual teachers stated that they planned to continue teaching in bilingual classrooms through the rest of their careers. One of the teachers said she had been converted to a supporter of bilingual education when she moved to El Paso and saw firsthand that the program worked.

Five of the eight teachers who expressed concerns about the program felt that the ESL component was not stressed enough and that the district-wide ESL teaching manual needed to be revised. Their concern with the ESL portion of the program was reflected in their comments about wanting students to transfer as soon as possible to regular classes. They generally thought that the Spanish-dominant students were not getting enough instruction in ESL and were thereby lagging in their English acquisition.

The teachers felt that the district ESL curriculum guide needed revision because it did not provide enough activities and variety for the students. The teachers wanted exposure to more ideas for teaching, especially since no ESL textbooks or other materials were provided for the children. Two teachers mentioned further that the grammatical sequence presented in the existing manual was poor and unrealistic.

The desire for a stronger ESL program was expressed enthusiastically by one teacher:

> I would want to see an ESL resource center in the future where a teacher needing assistance in her teaching would receive help; where a parent in need of English instruction would be taught; a center open after school hours and on Saturdays for all those students wanting enrichment ESL activities or tutoring; a center where a new student coming from Mexico would be well oriented and taught English in order to function successfully in a regular classroom.

Other issues about which two of the teachers felt very strongly were: inadequate teacher training in general; a lack of knowledge on the part of the public about bilingual education; large, overcrowded classrooms; a lack of materials; and the burden imposed on the bilingual teacher who had to work twice as hard as a teacher in a monolingual English class. These teachers suggested:

> (Requiring) every bilingual and monolingual teacher working with Spanish-dominant students to take a course on the theory of bilingual education. Some teachers find themselves teaching the students but they don't know why they have to learn in their native tongue. These teachers must have a complete understanding of bilingual education before they are placed in a bilingual classroom.
>
> (Asking) parents to come to workshops where they would be informed about bilingual education. . . . (The parents) have only heard the negative side . . . of course, coming from misinformed people.

Site 04: Arizona

All of the teachers at the Navajo site felt the Navajo children were benefitting from their bilingual program. Several teachers said that, since the bilingual program was still in its development stages, its main problem was a lack of materials for the Navajo-dominant children. They thought, too, that more precise guidelines needed to be established for Navajo literacy.

The teachers emphasized that bilingual education was important for their students because "the students lose interest in school when they don't understand." One teacher said half of her students did not understand or speak English when they entered her classroom.

A Navajo teacher felt that her program was successful but that there was a need for community awareness:

> I think the program is going pretty good. The people that are involved with bilingual education and our principal support us. She is Navajo and she understands the important rules of bilingual education. . . . One of the problems is that the community and the parents don't know what is taught in bilingual education or what is happening.

Site 05: California

The teachers at the Oakland and San Francisco site were supportive of the bilingual program in their schools. They did, however, offer these cautionary observations.

A monolingual Anglo teacher who team-taught with a bilingual teacher said about her program:

> The quality of the teachers makes it successful and we really have good teachers in our bilingual program. The thing that I don't like to see about it is that if all the teachers in the bilingual program are Chinese and all the kids are Chinese and the kids stay in the bilingual program from kindergarten to fifth grade, that they are segregated in themselves too much. That's one reason I stay in there. Because I feel that the children need to have a Caucasian teacher now and then.

A bilingual teacher stressed the importance of the teacher's language competency.

> Just be sure you know the languages if you want to be in the bilingual classroom. I think you just have to be a good model for the children and to understand the difficulties that they face. And to be very careful that you are teaching them the correct English so that they don't have to unlearn and relearn and waste all that time.

And another monolingual English teacher commented on her personal difficulty in coping with a bilingual setting:

> It's just easier to relate to the English proficient student, of course. I feel that they give the right response. But with limited-English students, sometimes it has to be drawn out. Perhaps someone else has to translate for me, or I'll have to wait and do some other special skill structuring for them. So they are a special group in themselves.

Site 07: Illinois

All of the teachers at the Illinois site felt that their bilingual program was going well. One teacher emphasized teacher enthusiasm: "The teachers in the program are very dedicated . . . and the children have scored very well in their testing."

Another teacher said that the bilingual program gave the students "a positive self-image," thereby enhancing learning. A combined third and fourth grade teacher suggested that due to the "excellent program" student attendance was high and the students were well disciplined. Many of the teachers mentioned that they would like to see the bilingual program extended to the upper grades where many students were dropping out.

The only general complaint concerned a lack of bilingual materials. The teachers would have liked math and science books developed in Spanish.

Site 08: Oregon

The bilingual program in Salem, Oregon, had been operating since 1975. Originally the program was aimed exclusively at Spanish-speaking students. For the last two years it had assisted newly arrived Southeast Asian refugees.

The teachers expressed concerns that, despite the helpfulness of the district bilingual office and parental support, the bilingual program in Salem lacked adequate resources. This was particularly true for the Southeast Asian students. These various comments were made:

> I lack materials and media for Indochinese instruction. Everything must be modified. The modifications must be available for the child who is not able to read in English. But these kids are normal or above in intelligence so you can't rely on current basal materials for remedial readers.
>
> I enjoy the children, but when I cannot do what I feel is needed to help them in terms of administrative support, I am very frustrated. I do not feel that there are adequate resources to do a good job.
>
> Recent federal and state budgetary cuts are basically going to reduce the effectiveness of the bilingual program. This will result in increased dropout rates for LEPs; they will be going to high school without the language skills necessary in order to succeed. As a result, they will end up working in the mushroom factories because of the lack of educational opportunities. These are bright students, and it is not their fault that the system is unable to give them the same opportunities as are given to the English-speaking Anglo child.

In addition to their difficulty in obtaining resources, both monolingual and bilingual teachers appeared to experience frequent frustration and fatigue. A teacher who was unable to speak the students' native language said:

> The frustration you have is not being able to explain the concept in the native language. The frustration is the aide can't explain in the native language because the aide doesn't have the knowledge skills.

A bilingual teacher complained that she did not have enough time to work with students individually at least in part because of the effort needed to teach in both languages. She said:

> I feel that neither the social studies nor sciences are geared to the bilingual classroom because since my students are proficient in English, they need to

> be instructed in English. I think it takes too much time and energy to keep translating the same idea back and forth between English and Spanish for the one student who does not speak English.

This teacher, however, was aware of the other side of that dilemma. She added:

> I don't think we have the materials or the manpower to have two separate social studies groups, one Spanish and one in English. I think that the student who does not speak English is placed at a disadvantage when it comes to social studies because he or she is not getting the same information the other students are.

Site 09: Hawaii

The Site 09 teachers in general held very favorable attitudes toward their bilingual programs. They did, however, complain of inadequate resources, excessive paperwork, large classes, and some minor annoyances.

One teacher said she enjoyed her program but added:

> The only thing is the forms that I am doing. You know all the things they want me to submit to the district. I have to take it home and that's my entire weekend.

The main concern of two of the interviewed teachers was trying to deal with five grade levels that came to them at the same time. Another teacher, with the help of a part-time teacher, handled 50 students in seven grades. Still another teacher reported: "Handling all 70-plus students is too much for me."

The size of the classrooms themselves and overlapping schedules created other problems. One teacher was critical of the 90 minute period required for bilingual instruction as being too long since it sometimes caused students to miss science, health, or art classes. A 45-minute bilingual requirement for other students, however, was considered too short by some teachers.

Summary

Characteristics of the Teachers

A total of 89 teachers took part in the language surveys and curriculum interviews on which these data were based. From 10 to 12 teachers participated at each of the eight sites.

Language. English was the native language of 28 percent of the 89 teachers. Spanish, Navajo, Chinese, or Ilokano/Tagalog was the first language of 70 percent of the teachers. Languages other than those examined in this study were native to the remaining 2 percent of the teachers. The largest proportion of teachers, 42 percent, had a first language of Spanish.

About 22 percent of the participating teachers taught in only English. About 77 percent taught in both English and the students' native language. The largest proportion of the teachers, 48 percent, taught part of the time in Spanish.

Twenty-seven percent of the teachers said that more than 50 percent of their class time was spent on ESL. Another 24 percent did not answer or were not asked this question. The remaining 44 teachers spent time on ESL as follows: 19 percent of the teachers, 26 to 50 percent of their time; 20 percent of the teachers, 11 to 25 percent of their time; 3 percent of the teachers, 1 to 10 percent of their time; and 7 percent of the teachers, no time. New York was the only site that reported no time spent on ESL. In only two sites, Florida and Oregon, did as many as half the teachers say they spent more than 50 percent of their time on ESL.

Responses by teachers to the question of how much class time was spent instructing in a non-English language were more complete; only 8 percent did not answer or were not asked this question. The largest group of teachers, 35 percent, said that 26 to 50 percent of their time was spent in non-English instruction. The second largest group, 24 percent, spent no time on such instruction. Another 17 percent spent more than 50 percent of their time, while the rest spent 25 percent or less of their time.

Experience. A large number of teachers (29 percent) had 6 to 10 years of general teaching experience. Another 26 percent had 1 to 5 years. At least 11 percent of the teachers had 21 to 30 years of experience. New York had the most teachers (a total of eight) in the 1 to 5 year category. Hawaii had the highest number of teachers (four) who had taught for 21 to 30 years.

The amount of bilingual teaching experience was somewhat less than the amount of general teaching experience. The majority of the teachers (55 percent) fell into the 1 to 5 year category, although another 32 percent had 6 to 10 years of bilingual experience. The Texas, Arizona, California, and Hawaii sites each had one or two teachers with no bilingual teaching experience. Florida, on the other hand, had one teacher who had taught bilingually for 16 to 20 years.

Training. In the area of professional training, 73 percent of the participating teachers had at least a bachelor's degree. Twenty-four percent had master's degrees and 3 percent had Ph.D.'s. In addition, 61 percent of the teachers had bilingual credentials.

A total of 75 of the 89 teachers (84 percent) had had some type of bilingual professional training. About 30 percent of the teachers had received bilingual education training through inservice workshops. Another 29 percent had taken courses in bilingual education and 12 percent had bilingual education degrees. Other teachers had been trained in ethnic studies or through ESL inservice programs. All of the participating teachers at the New York and Illinois sites had received some type of bilingual training. At the Oregon site, only half the teachers had had such training. Bilingual professional training at the other sites involved from 70 to 92 percent of the teachers.

View of Entry/Exit Criteria

A comparison of teachers' views of entry criteria for bilingual education programs both across and within sites revealed that, in the teachers' opinion, students were placed in bilingual classes: (a) if they were non- or limited-English-speaking or (b) if their parents requested. The New York site and two of the classes studied at the Florida site were unusual in that the bilingual program was considered an opportunity for enrichment and was open to English-dominant students; only when those bilingual programs were full were students placed according to the level of their English language skills. At other sites, where the bilingual programs were considered transitional, various language and achievement tests were used to determine whether students needed bilingual instruction. One of the California schools was unique in that it had been started specifically in response to a large influx of Chinese immigrants and was open to all non-English-speaking newcomers; its main objective was to offer a special one-year education program to ease new students' adjustment to the U.S. school system.

The teachers' opinions of criteria for exit from a bilingual program varied greatly. Although the greatest differences appeared among individual teachers within sites, some variations seemed to be site related. One such difference was apparent in New York where, since the program was not considered transitional, most teachers saw no need for exiting. A different approach was observed at the Texas site where several teachers stated that the sooner students were placed in regular classrooms the better; these observations coincided with numerous statements at this site that ESL needed to be stressed more and that students were not learning English quickly enough. Teachers at the Illinois site could be placed somewhere in between; they favored students' remaining in the bilingual program, but felt students were ready for an English only class when they could work in English at 80 percent of their grade level.

The teachers' differing views of exit criteria seemed to stem from their individual perspectives regarding both native and English language acquisition. On one hand were the teachers who saw appreciation of one's native culture and proficiency in the native language as goals that were equal in importance to the acquisition of English. On the other hand were the teachers who, usually in keeping with the policy of their districts, viewed bilingual instruction as a temporary aid that would help limited-English-speaking students to adjust to a new culture and to progress academically. Both of these perspectives were expressed by teachers at each site.

Given that the majority of the bilingual programs studied were in some form transitional, the teachers overwhelmingly agreed that English proficiency was a crucial exit criterion. They diverged, however, on exactly what constituted proficiency. The predominant definitions of proficiency emphasized these abilities: to understand and be understood in English; to speak, read, and write in English--at least at the appropriate grade level; to use correct grammar; and to function in society and meet daily needs using English. The teachers expanded upon these basic definitions when they described proficiency as feeling "comfortable with the language," being "relaxed, outgoing, associating with others of different language skills," and being able to "understand and appreciate the English culture, customs, and traditions."

Although a few teachers felt English proficiency could be determined solely by the students' performance on achievement tests in English, or on tests of English language skills, most teachers felt other factors were significant. Some felt that both English proficiency and academic achievement, or proficiency in both English and the native language, should be considered. Most teachers felt that their own observations and judgments should be weighed as well as variables such as students' physical, social, and emotional development, students' self-concept, parents' feelings toward the bilingual program, and benefits to the students of exposure to their native culture. A few teachers indicated that minority language students with "negative attitudes" toward their bilingual program should be exited. An example of the disparity of views regarding transition was seen in Florida, where the official district policy was for students to be able to function in English-only classes after two years in the bilingual program. Two teachers from this site stated that students should continue in bilingual classes from kindergarten through grade 6; another thought bilingual classes should be available "for years on end."

Philosophy of Bilingual Education

Several beliefs concerning bilingual education appeared very consistently in the interviews with the teachers. Two strongly felt and often stated opinions were: that bilingual instruction was the only way for LEP students to learn English while also progressing academically, and that learning a second language was beneficial to all students, not just minority language students. The development of students' skills in English was a major goal, but the degree to which this was stressed in conjunction with the native language varied from teacher to teacher and site to site. Some teachers aimed to develop proficiency in both languages while others utilized the native language primarily to assist students in understanding instructions or concepts. Most teachers expressed as a high priority the need for minority students to maintain or develop appreciation for their native language and culture; frequently these teachers stated that such appreciation was crucial to preserving the minority students' positive self-concept or feeling of self-worth.

It was interesting to note that at the New York site teachers said some students expressed negative feelings toward their native language, while at the Texas site students felt pressure from their peers to avoid using English. There were possibly some connections between the students' feelings, local attitudes toward the native language, and the emphases of the bilingual teachers. In New York, where there was a strong need in the community for English as well as Spanish, teachers felt a need to stress maintenance of the students' native language and culture. In Texas, where students could function well in the community knowing only Spanish, teachers thought the acquisition of English during class needed particular emphasis.

Several teachers from across sites felt that increasing proficiency in the students' native language would be beneficial in helping the students to learn English since the basic language skills were transferable. A teacher at the Navajo site, however, feared that children who learned Navajo first would never "catch up" in English reading. The use of the students' native language for explaining and clarifying academic content was viewed as providing minority students an equal opportunity for learning.

There was some consistency in the teachers' philiosophies of language use during bilingual instruction. There was general agreement that instruction during reading and language arts classes should be confined to a single designated language, but that language alternation was helpful during math, science, or social studies to explain terminology and concepts. Teachers seemed to differ considerably, however, on their emphasis on the native language. At the Texas site, for example, most teachers agreed that the content of a lesson should never be sacrificed for English and that the minority language should be used whenever necessary for explanations. A teacher in one of the California schools, on the other hand, said she would try any technique she could to get an idea across before using the minority language. She said, "I don't want them to say, well, if I don't get the English, she'll tell me in Chinese soon." There was a consensus that being able to use the students' native language made explanations in certain content areas easier, but monolingual and bilingual teachers in particular seemed to disagree on exactly how this should be done. Bilingual teachers were comfortable alternating languages during a class. Some monolingual English teachers preferred aides who spoke the minority language; others liked for a teacher who spoke the minority language to give a specific lesson before the same lesson was given in English; still others thought separate English and minority language curricula with ESL classes would work best. Teachers at the New York and Texas sites stated that a goal of their bilingual programs was to gradually increase English and decrease the minority language used in the classroom during the school year.

Perceptions of Program Effectiveness

Although the great majority of teachers both across and within sites seemed satisfied with their bilingual programs, some criticisms of programs were offered. A few of the complaints, such as inadequate resources or not enough time spent with students, were fairly consistent across sites. Most problems, however, appeared site related. In Oregon, for instance, the lack of instructional materials for the recently arrived Indochinese students was particularly acute; the newness of this particular student group may have been responsible, too, for a lack of teachers and aides with the necessary language and cultural experience to instruct these students bilingually. In Texas, where there was pressure to move minority language students into regular classes as soon as possible, the teachers said repeatedly that they felt too much time was spent on Spanish with Spanish-dominant students and that the Hispanic-speaking students were not learning English quickly enough. Most of the criticism voiced at the New York site came from teachers who taught in the district's LEAP program for students in need of special assistance; these teachers were frustrated in attending to the diverse problems of their students while feeling pressure to have the students show progress on English academic achievement tests. Teachers in the Hawaii study schools, at least based on the interview data, may have faced more severe problems with multiple grade levels in one class and with bureaucratic paperwork than the other teachers.

There were some criticisms, in addition, that were mentioned only at individual sites but that may not have been site related. These included the comment by an Anglo teacher at a California school who said that Chinese students being taught by Chinese teachers could be too isolated; she herself stayed in the bilingual program "because I feel the children need a Caucasian teacher now and then." In Illinois, teachers indicated that extending the bilingual program to upper grades could have helped reduce the dropout rate. Statements by monolingual English teachers in Florida who said they would be helped by having a Spanish teacher assist in or teach specific lessons may also have been unrelated to the site.

REFERENCES

Bossert, S. T. Tasks and social relationships in classrooms: A study of classroom organization and its consequences. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979. (ASA Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series)

Cummins, J. Metalinguistic development of children in bilingual education programs: Data from Irish and Canadian Ukrainian-English programs. In Paradis, M., (Ed.), The fourth LACUS forum 1977. Columbia, S. C.: Harnbeam Press, 1978.

Cummins, J. Viewpoints: Psycholinguistic evidence. In Bilingual education: Current perspectives. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Fisher, C. W., Guthrie, L. F., & Mandinach, E. B. Verification of bilingual instructional features (SBIF-83-R.12). San Francisco, Ca.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

Fishman, J. A. The social science perspective. In Bilingual education: Current perspectives (Vol. 1), Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Fuentes, E. J. & Weisenbaker, J. M. The use of teacher rating of oral English proficiency as a covariate in the analysis of reading scores. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, Ca., 1979. (Research Triangle Institute)

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Gonzalez, G. Teaching bilingual children. In Bilingual education: Current perspectives (Vol. 2). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Good, T. L., & Power, C. Designing successful classroom environments for different types of students. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1976, 8(1), 45-60.

Guthrie, L. F., & Fisher, C. W. Stability of instructional system and process for a sample of eighty-five students in the SBIF study (SBIF-83-R.13.1). San Francisco, Ca.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

Johnson, E. Report on bilingual pilot schools in New York City: A study of court-ordered program for pupils with English language difficulty.

New York: Community Service Society, 1975.

Lambert, W. E., Tucker, G. R., & d'Anglejan, A. Cognitive and attitudinal consequences of bilingual schooling: The St. Lambert project through grade five. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1973, *65*, 141-159.

Mehan, H. *Participation structures.* Paper presented for Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Ecological Theory of Teaching Project, San Francisco, Ca., 1979.

Nieves-Squires, S., & Goodrich, R. *Working definitions of terms for the Bilingual Instructional Features Study. Bilingual Instructional Features Planning Study* (Vol. 1). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1980.

Paulston, C. B. Viewpoint: Research. In *Bilingual education: Current perspectives* (Vol. 2). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Philips, S. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In Cazden, C., John, V., & Hymes, D. (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Pifer, A. *Bilingual education and the Hispanic challenge. Annual report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

Roessel, R. A., Jr. *Navajo education in action: The Rough Rock Demonstration School*. Chinle, AZ: Navajo Curriculum Center, Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1977.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Toukomaa, P. *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki, Finland: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, 1976.

Spolsky, B. The establishment of language education policy in multilingual societies. In Spolsky, B., & Cooper, R. (Eds.), *Frontiers of bilingual education*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1977.

Steinberg, L. S. *Report on bilingual education: A study of programs for pupils with English language difficulty in New York City public schools*. New York: Community Service Society, 1974.

Tikunoff, W. J. (Ed.). *Compatibility of the SBIF features with other research on instruction for LEP students* (SBIF-83-R.9/10). San Francisco, Ca.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983a.

Tikunoff, W. J. (Ed.). *Utility of the SBIF features for the instruction of LEP students* (SBIF-83-R.15/16). San Francisco, Ca.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983b.

Villegas, A. M. Stability of instructional system and process for a sample of ten bilingual teachers in the SBIF study (SBIF-83-R.13). San Francisco, Ca.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1983.

Ward, B. A., Rounds, T., Packer, M., Mergendoller, J. R. & Tikunoff, W. J. Junior High School Transition Study, Vol. IV: Student experience during and response to transition to junior high school. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1981.